

E-FILED: 04/27/09

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION**

RAMBUS INC.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR INC., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. C 05-00334 RMW

RAMBUS INC.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., et
al

Defendants.

Case No. C 05-02298 RMW

**FINDINGS OF FACT AND
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW WITH
RESPECT TO SAMSUNG'S COUNTS I-
III AND ESTOPPEL DEFENSE**

[REDACTED]

These Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law concern the court trial of that portion of the dispute between Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., Samsung Electronics America, Inc., Samsung Semiconductor, Inc. and Samsung Austin Semiconductor, L.P. (collectively "Samsung") and Rambus Inc. ("Rambus") based upon the allegations set forth in Counts I-III of Samsung's Counterclaims against Rambus in Action Nos. C-05-00334 RMW and C-05-02298 RMW. Samsung alleges that: (1) Rambus breached § 3.8 of the SDR/DDR IC and SDR/DDR Memory Module Patent License Agreement Between Rambus, Inc. and Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. ("2000 SDR/DDR License," "License" or "Agreement") by failing to notify Samsung

1 of the more favorable license rate it gave to Infineon and by refusing to provide that rate to
 2 Samsung (Count I); (2) Rambus breached § 8.5 by failing to negotiate in good faith an extension
 3 of the License (Count II); and (3) Rambus breached the covenant of duty of good faith and fair
 4 dealing implied in the License by failing to adjust the royalty rate paid by Samsung under the
 5 License to match the lower effective royalty rate provided for in the Rambus/Infineon License
 6 and by failing to negotiate an extension in good faith (Count III).

7 These Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law also cover Samsung's affirmative
 8 defense of equitable estoppel whereby Samsung asserts that Rambus is equitably estopped from
 9 taking actions against Samsung that are inconsistent with the Rambus/Infineon license.

10 The evidentiary portion of the trial was conducted by the court beginning on September
 11 22, 2008 and concluding on October 1, 2008. These Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law
 12 are based on the evidence received during that trial which included, by stipulation, the relevant
 13 evidence admitted in the prior jury trial of monopolization and related claims brought by the
 14 Hynix, Micron, and Nanya entities against Rambus. *Hynix Semiconductor Inc. v. Rambus Inc.*;
 15 *Rambus Inc. v. Hynix et al.*; *Rambus Inc. v. Micron Technology et al.*, Nos. C-00-20905 RMW,
 16 C-05-00334 RMW, C-06-00244 RMW ("Coordinated Jury Trial"). The jury verdict was
 17 rendered on March 26, 2008.

18 FINDINGS OF FACT

19 A. Chronology

20 1. Rambus was founded in 1990 by two professors, Dr. Michael Farmwald and
 21 Dr. Mark Horowitz, who had been working together to address the increasing gap between
 22 microprocessor performance and DRAM performance. Jury Tr. at 4079:8-4081:24, 4091:9-
 23 4095:10, 5489:23-5490:3.¹

24 2. On April 18, 1990, Drs. Farmwald and Horowitz filed a patent application, serial
 25 number 07/510,898 ("the '898 application"), containing numerous claims relating to their efforts
 26 to solve this performance gap problem. Exh. 5131.

27
 28 ¹ References herein to "Jury Trial Tr." refer to the transcript of the Coordinated Jury Trial. References to
 "Trial Tr." refer to the transcript of the September 22, 2008 trial. References to "Exh." refer to admitted
 trial exhibits in either the Coordinated Jury Trial or the September 22, 2008 trial.

1 3. On April 16, 1991, Rambus filed an international patent application pursuant to
2 the Patent Cooperation Treaty (the "PCT application"). Exh. 3583. The PCT application was
3 published on October 31, 1991. The specification contained in the PCT application was identical
4 to that contained in the '898 application and described, according to Rambus, the inventions that
5 are at issue in Rambus's infringement claims against Samsung in the above-captioned actions.
6 *id.*

7 4. On April 7, 1992, Geoff Tate, Rambus's Chief Executive Officer, provided Dr.
8 Yong Park, Samsung's Senior Vice President of Business Development and Product Planning,
9 with a copy of the PCT application. Exh. 10667.

10 5. Rambus received its first issued U.S. patent resulting from the '898 application in
11 September 1993. Exh. 3219. The '898 application resulted in the filing over time of numerous
12 continuation and divisional applications. Exh. 8888. Some of the patents that resulted from this
13 process are at issue in the above-captioned cases but the first of those patents did not issue until
14 January 30, 2001 (U.S. Patent 6,182,184).

15 6. On November 7, 1994, Rambus and Samsung began a business alliance when
16 they entered into an agreement entitled the Semiconductor Technology License Agreement
17 ("RDRAM Agreement"). Exh. 6110. This agreement covered certain intellectual property used
18 in the manufacture and sale of RDRAM devices and required Samsung to pay license fees and
19 several different percentage-of-net-sales royalties. *Id.* § 4.2(a).

20 7. In 1996, Intel announced that it planned to endorse "Rambus-2," a next generation
21 version of Rambus's proprietary DRAM technology (later known as Direct RDRAM). Jury Tr.
22 at 3000:18-3003:11.

23 8. In 1996 and early 1997, Rambus and Samsung renegotiated the 1994 RDRAM
24 Agreement resulting on February 7, 1997 in the execution of Addendum No. 1 to Semiconductor
25 Technology License Agreement to cover Rambus's next-generation memory technology, Direct
26 RDRAM. Trial Ex. 4201.

27 9. As of 2000, Rambus described its goal to establish Rambus DRAM as the
28 dominant memory in the industry as "[o]ur #1 priority." Trial Ex. 4009 (Hitachi Settlement
Q&A) at 6; Trial Tr. at 740:1-6 ("We wanted RDRAM to be as successful as possible in 2000" . .

1 . . .), 740:19-741:1 (" . . . that would make it the most dominant memory if it were to be the most
2 successful. . . ."), 741:2-24 (" . . . we continued to work hard to make RDRAM successful.").

3 10. At that time, Samsung was the top supplier of RDRAM memory devices and
4 accounted for more total RDRAM sales than the next three suppliers combined. Trial Tr. at
5 195:2-15, 739:15-25, 740:11-18; Trial Ex. 3209 (Summary of Worldwide DRAM Sales, 1996-
6 2006).

7 11. On July 25, 2000 representatives of Rambus and Samsung first met to discuss a
8 potential license covering SDR and DDR products. Exh. 4204.

9 12. On August 8, 2000 Rambus initiated patent infringement litigation against
10 Infineon Technologies, Inc. ("Infineon") in which Infineon's defenses included unclean hands for
11 alleged spoliation of documents. Exh. 4264.

12 13. On October 27 and October 31, 2000, Rambus and Samsung respectively signed
13 the 2000 SDR/DDR License. Exh. 4226. The SDR/DDR License had an effective date of July
14 1, 2000 and a five-year term extending through June 30, 2005. *Id.* §§ 1.1, 8.1. It included a
15 most favored licensee provision, a provision for the audit of Samsung's sales for royalty payment
16 verification purposes, and an agreement to negotiate an extension or new agreement in good
17 faith. *Id.* §§ 3.8, 4.1 and 8.5. In an On October 27 and October 31, 2000, Rambus and Samsung
18 respectively signed the 2000 SDR/DDR License. Exh. 4226. The SDR/DDR License had an
19 effective date of July 1, 2000 and a five-year term extending through June 30, 2005. *Id.* §§ 1.1,
20 8.1. It included a most favored licensee provision, a provision for the audit of Samsung's sales
21 for royalty payment verification purposes, and an agreement to negotiate an extension or new
22 agreement in good faith. *Id.* §§ 3.8, 4.1 and 8.5. In an e-mail dated October 31, 2000 from Jay
23 Shim, Samsung's chief negotiator, to Neil Steinberg, Rambus's chief negotiator, Mr. Shim
24 advised that Samsung had executed the Agreement but that he was working on a post-execution
25 amendment, as they had discussed, to revise the wording of Section 8.5 to address a most
26 favorable royalty condition in an extension or new agreement. Exh. 4227.

27 14. On November 7, 2000, Mr. Shim sent an "amendment proposal" to Steinberg
28 via email. Exh. 4230 at 1. On November 21, 2000, Mr. Steinberg sent an email responding to
Mr. Shim's proposed Amendment. Exh. 4232 at 1. Neither of these proposed amendments to the

1 2000 SDR/DDR License was ever signed or assented to by the parties. Trial Tr. at 248
2 (testimony of J. Shim).

3 15. In July 2001 the parties did negotiate and execute an amendment regarding
4 renewal of their Agreement. Exh. 4240 (Amendment No. 1). As executed, this amendment
5 imposed an obligation on Rambus to negotiate a renewal agreement "solely and exclusively"
6 with respect to "Licensed Products," as that term was defined under the SDR/DDR License.
7 Exh. 4240 ¶ 1 ("This Amendment No. 1 relates solely and exclusively to SDR SDRAM, SDR
8 SGRAM, DDR SDRAM and DDR SGRAM as defined in the Agreement . . ."). Rambus signed
9 Amendment No. 1 on July 10, 2001, and Samsung signed on July 18, 2001. Exh. 4240.
10 Amendment No. 1 provided, among other things, that if Rambus licensed Infineon, it could
11 terminate the Amendment on 10 days notice. *Id.*

12 16. In December 2003, Rambus notified Samsung that Rambus would be conducting
13 a royalty audit pursuant to Section 4.1 of the SDR/DDR License. Trial Tr. at 256:6-14.

14 17. By at least July 2004, Rambus pressed Samsung to begin renewal negotiations for
15 a license that would replace or follow the expiration of the SDR/DDR License.

16 18. Samsung and Rambus representatives met on July 9, 2004 in Korea (Trial Tr.
17 at 259:3-17, 945:22-946:6) but Mr. Shim's position on behalf of Samsung was that there was "no
18 need to rush." *Id.* at 951:13-952:21.

19 19. On January 25, 2005, Rambus sued Hynix, Infineon, Nanya, and Inotera
20 Memories, Inc. for infringement of certain Rambus patents. Case No. 05-00334 RMW ("334
21 case").

22 20. On February 20, 2005, Mr. Blumberg, Vice President of Licensing for Rambus
23 and Rambus's chief negotiator at the time, sent an offer for renewal to Mr. Shim. Trial Tr. at
24 950:13-22; Exh. 4263 (hereinafter the "February 20 Renewal Offer").

25 21. On March 21, 2005, Rambus and Infineon executed a Settlement and License
26 Agreement resolving the litigation between them. Exh. 4264 (Infineon Settlement and License
27 Agreement). The settlement was favorable to Infineon because the judge presiding over the case
28 had announced his intent to dismiss it based upon Rambus's alleged unclean hands (spoliation of
documents).

1 22. Samsung requested that Rambus make the Infineon royalty rate effective for
2 Samsung under Section 3.8 of the 2000 SDR/DDR Agreement, but Rambus refused. 1014:12-18
3 ("Mr. Shim said he wanted the Infineon deal and you said no; isn't that true? At that time, that is
4 true.").

5 23. On March 22, 2005 Rambus notified Samsung that it was terminating
6 Amendment No. 1. Exh. 4265 (Letter from I. Blumberg to Samsung re: Notice of termination of
7 Amendment No. 1 to the SDR/DDR IC and SDR/DDR Memory Patent License Agreement
8 ("Amendment"), dated Mar. 22, 2005) ("I am sending this notice of termination pursuant to
9 Section 7 of the Amendment. This letter is that notice of termination and the Amendment shall
10 terminate automatically ten days after this notice."). Ten days thereafter, the relationship
11 between Samsung and Rambus with respect to SDRAM and DDR SDRAM memory devices was
12 again governed by the 2000 SDR/DDR License.

13 24. On April 1, 2005 Mr. Blumberg wrote to Mr. Shim and withdrew Rambus's
14 February 20 Renewal Offer. Exh. 4268.

15 25. On May 18, 2005, Mr. Blumberg sent a further proposal to Mr. Shim. In this
16 proposal, Blumberg suggested the parties workout a one year standstill agreement. Exh. 4271.
17 He advised that "[c]onclusion of such an agreement before July 1 remains a top priority for
18 Rambus." *Id.* Blumberg set forth a series of specific terms for a one year standstill.

19 26. On June 3, 2005, Mr. Shim responded with Samsung's standstill offer. Exh. 4273;
20 Trial Tr. at 968:10-13. No standstill or other agreement was ever successfully negotiated.

21 27. On June 6, 2005 Rambus terminated the 2000 SDR/DDR Agreement citing
22 Samsung's "failure to comply with the auditing provisions of Section 4[.]" Trial Tr. at 304:5-14;
23 305:5-8; Trial Ex. 4276 (Letter from J. Danforth to J. Shim, dated June 6, 2005) ("[d]espite
24 having ample opportunity to cure since receiving written notice, Samsung still has not complied
25 with these auditing provisions. This letter is to inform you that in view of Samsung's continued
26 breach and failure to cure . . . Rambus hereby immediately terminates the SDR/DDR License
27 Agreement."). Rambus filed its First Amended Complaint in the '334 case on June 6, 2005,
28 asserting the same patents as in the original complaint but adding Samsung as a defendant. On
June 6, 2005, Rambus also sued Samsung in a separate suit alleging infringement of certain

Rambus patents. Case No. 05-02298 RMW ("2298 case").

B. Factual Findings on Specific Claims

1. Section 3.8 of the SDR/DDR License Was Triggered by the Rambus/Infineon Settlement Agreement

The parties dispute whether Section 3.8 of the SDR/DDR License was triggered by the Rambus/Infineon Settlement Agreement obligating Rambus to give Samsung the benefit of a royalty rate calculated in accordance with the Rambus/Infineon Settlement Agreement which provided for Rambus to receive a lump-sum payment in installments. The court makes the following factual findings relevant to that issue.

a. Rambus represented in the 2000 SDR/DDR License its intent with respect to licensing manufacturers then in litigation with Rambus:

WHEREAS, Rambus represents that, after November 1, 2000, the royalty rates offered to any semiconductor memory manufacturer which is currently in litigation with Rambus for infringement of any Rambus Patent, as defined herein, shall be the standard royalty rates and such standard royalty rates are higher than the royalty rates set forth in Section 3.1(b) of this Agreement; and

WHEREAS, Rambus further represents that royalty rates offered after January 1, 2001 to all prospective licensees shall be such standard royalty rates.

Exh. 4226 (2000 SDR/DDR Agreement) p. 2.

b. Rambus specifically extended most favored licensee protection to Samsung in the SDR/DDR License:

3.8 *If at any time during this Agreement, the royalty rate agreed to be paid or ordered to be paid by a Third Party, whether by settlement or by court or agency order, for products corresponding to SDR SDRAM, SDR SGRAM, DDR SDRAM, or DDR SGRAM is lower than that specified in Section 3.1(b) of this Agreement, Rambus shall notify Samsung, in writing, within ten (10) days of the effective date of such lower royalty rate and such lower royalty rate shall be effective for this Agreement the first day of the royalty reporting period in which written notice by Rambus is made. If the lower royalty rate is limited geographically due to a court or agency order, then Samsung's lower royalty rate shall be similarly limited to sales in the same geographic area. Should, by agreement, subsequent order, or amendment, modification, or reversal of the court or agency order (whether on appeal or otherwise), the lower royalty rate of any litigant change, then the royalty for Samsung shall change correspondingly, but not to exceed the rates specified in Section 3.1(b).*

Id. § 3.8 (Emphasis added).

c. The negotiation of the parties leading up to the execution of the SDR/DDR License shows the importance to Rambus of the License and Rambus's unconditional assurance

1 to Samsung of most favored licensee status.

2 i. During the course of the negotiations, Mr. Shim, representing Samsung,
3 and Mr. Steinberg, representing Rambus, served as the primary negotiators of the 2000
4 SDR/DDR Agreement. Trial Tr. at 211:12-20, 383:14-385:5.

5 ii. At the parties' July 25, 2000 meeting, Rambus told Samsung that it was
6 "a valuable and very good partner," and that Samsung was "in an excellent position to secure the
7 most favorable terms" if it signed the SDR/DDR License quickly. Trial Ex. 4024 at 2-3; Trial
8 Tr. at 205:22-206:15, 703:25-704:18.

9 iii. Mr. Steinberg stressed the importance of the Samsung/Rambus
10 relationship, and he emphasized that Rambus wished to continue that relationship and grow and
11 prosper with Samsung. Trial Tr. at 205:22-206:3.

12 iv. On August 10, 2000, Mr. Steinberg sent Rambus's first draft of the
13 License to Mr. Shim. Trial Ex. 4208 (Email from N. Steinberg to J. Shim, dated Aug. 10, 2000);
14 Trial Tr. at 206:24-207:14.

15 v. The August 10, 2000 draft agreement did not contain a most favored
16 licensee provision or recitals stating that future licensees would be offered standard royalty rates
17 that would be higher than Samsung's royalty rates. Trial Ex. 4209 (Draft - SDR/DDR Patent
18 License Agreement between Samsung and Rambus); Trial Tr. at 208:3-16.

19 vi. On September 13, 2000, Geoff Tate, Rambus's Chief Executive Officer,
20 sent an updated negotiation schedule to Samsung's Y.W. Lee and assured him that entering the
21 agreement "will give Samsung the best possible terms and will result in Samsung having a
22 competitive advantage over those who have sued us rather than negotiate." Exh. 4212 (Email
23 from G. Tate to Y.W. Lee, dated Sept. 14, 2000).

24 vii. On October 6, 2000, Mr. Shim sent Samsung's Term Sheet Proposal
25 to Rambus, which contained proposals for, *inter alia*: (1) "[a] provision specifying that in the
26 event the Rambus Patents are held to be unenforceable against any third party, it is agreed that
27 they (Rambus Patents) are unenforceable against Samsung"; (2) "[a] provision specifying that in
28 the event the Rambus Patents are held to be expressly or impliedly licensed based on Rambus's
activities as a member of JEDEC, it is agreed that Samsung's royalty rates shall be the lower of

1 that agreed to in the Agreement or that ordered by a court or an agency"; and (3) "[a] Most
2 Favorable Nations Clause in which Samsung is guaranteed to (i) the lowest possible royalty rates
3 and fees among all licensees, and (ii) a right to amend the royalty terms of the Agreement in the
4 event a court decision or an out-of-court settlement renders, after the execution of the
5 Agreement, lower royalty terms than agreed to, wherein such new lower royalty terms shall
6 apply to Samsung retroactively and Rambus shall refund the difference therein." Exh. 4214.
7 The Term Sheet Proposal also included a recital stating that following the execution of the
8 Agreement with Samsung higher royalty terms would take effect for any future third party
9 licensees. *Id.*; see Trial Tr. at 215:5-19 (the MFL provision was an "essential condition" to
10 Samsung).

11 viii. On October 11, 2000, Rambus revised the draft agreement, adding,
12 *inter alia*, most favored licensee protections and a representation that the royalty rates offered to
13 future licensees then in litigation with Rambus would be standard royalty rates higher than those
14 in the 2000 SDR/DDR Agreement. Exh. 4217 (Redline comparing Oct. 11th and Oct. 16th
15 drafts of the 2000 SDR/DDR Agreement); Trial Tr. at 428:22-429:1.

16 ix. On October 16, 2000, Mr. Shim requested revisions to the October 11
17 draft agreement, including an elaboration of the draft most favored licensee language to be in a
18 new section 3.8 with subparts (a) through (e) that specifically addressed, *inter alia*: a lower
19 "royalty paid by a Third Party, whether by settlement or by court or agency order"; either "no
20 royalty or a royalty based on a lower royalty rate" "[s]hould a court or agency of competent
21 jurisdiction make a determination that the Rambus Patents in suit are not enforceable or are
22 invalid"; and a method for adjusting royalty terms "should any Third Party be granted a license
23 on the basis of consideration other than a running royalty (for example, a lump sum)." Exh. 4215
24 at 4-5. Mr. Shim's proposal did not expressly address flat royalty payments payable on a
25 quarterly basis.

26 x. Later the same day, Mr. Steinberg responded without addressing the
27 issue of "a lump-sum" royalty and stated that he had amended the most favored licensee
28 provisions "to provide language expressing the fundamental intent of Section 3.9 that Samsung
not be put at a competitive disadvantage as a result of entering into the Agreement." Exh. 4216 at

1 2.

2 xi. Along with his e-mail, Mr. Steinberg enclosed a draft that, among
3 other things: (a) contained a most favored licensee provision that did not explicitly cover
4 licenses granted in settlements or pursuant to court or agency order; and (b) contained limited
5 most favored licensee protection related to Rambus's participation in JEDEC. Exh. 4408 (Draft -
6 SDR/DDR Patent License Agreement between Samsung and Rambus, dated Oct. 16, 2000); Exh.
7 4217 (Redline - SDR/DDR Patent License Agreement between Samsung and Rambus, dated Oct.
8 16, 2000).

9 xii. The October 16, 2000 draft agreement amended Section 3.9 to
10 include: "If at any time during the term of this Agreement, the parties desire to discuss the
11 royalty rate to be applied . . . pursuant to this Section 3.9, the parties shall meet to negotiate in
12 good faith with a view to determining a mutually satisfactory prospective royalty rate so that
13 Samsung is not at a competitive disadvantage relative to any Third Party." Exh. 4217 (Redline -
14 SDR/DDR Patent License Agreement between Samsung and Rambus, dated Oct. 16, 2000)
15 (emphasis added) at 19.

16 xiii. The October 16, 2000 draft agreement also included an additional
17 WHEREAS clause representation that higher standard royalty rates would be offered "to all
18 prospective licensees" after January 1, 2001. *Id.* at 2.

19 xiv. On October 17, 2000, Mr. Tate sent an email to Mr. Y.W. Lee urging
20 Samsung to "sign now" and stating that he believed Rambus had met most of Samsung's
21 requests, including "most favored royalty rate" and a "commitment that Samsung won't be at a
22 competitive disadvantage as a result of the outcome of pending litigation." Exh. 4218.

23 xv. In his October 17 email to Samsung, Mr. Tate wrote "[a]s you know
24 we are in court with [Hynix], Micron and Infineon. We expect to win our legal battles with them
25 although we don't control the schedule of the courts. When these companies choose to negotiate
26 license terms with us we will charge them substantially higher license fees and royalty rates." *Id.*

27 xvi. Mr. Tate also wrote to Mr. Y.W. Lee, in the October 17 email,
28 "Samsung and Rambus have enjoyed a very positive relationship the last several years,
especially since you have become directly involved with us. I know I have a high degree of

1 personal trust in you; and I hope you as well feel that during our relationship that my actions
2 have followed up on my commitments." *Id.*

3 xvii. On October 21, 2000, Mr. Steinberg sent Mr. Shim a revised
4 agreement, executed by Rambus and dated October 20, 2000, and urged Samsung to "take[] this
5 opportunity to gain a long term competitive advantage over several of its fiercest competitors!"
6 Exh. 4222.

7 xviii. The October 20 draft agreement removed the prior most favored
8 licensee language in Sections 3.8-3.10, and substituted broader language similar to Mr. Shim's
9 proposed 3.8(a) and 3.8(b). Exh. 4221 (Redline - SDR/DDR Patent License Agreement between
10 Samsung and Rambus, dated Oct. 20, 2000) at 18-19.

11 xix. On October 27, 2000, Mr. Steinberg sent an executed copy of the
12 final agreement to Mr. Shim. Exh. 4224.

13 xx. On October 31, 2000, the Agreement was fully executed by Jon Kang,
14 Vice President of Samsung Electronics, Co., Ltd. Exh. 4226.

15 xxi. On November 2, 2000 Mr. Tate assured Samsung that it "now has the
16 best deals on both RDRAM and SDRAM/DDR SDRAM." Exh. 4229.

17 xxii. The negotiating history of the final contract language in Section 3.8
18 demonstrates that the parties intended to cover different types of royalty rates, including a flat,
19 periodic royalty (e.g., an amount per calendar quarter). This is evident from, among other
20 things, the parties' discussion that Samsung would not suffer competitive harm if it accepted a
21 license, that all licensees would receive standard "royalty rates," and that the most favored
22 licensee provisions would also cover any "royalty rate," even if it arose from a litigation
23 settlement. Trial Tr. at 228:14-229:23.

24 d. Rambus's argues that the terms of Amendment No. 1 executed in July 2001
25 supports its argument that the parties only intended section 3.8 to cover "running royalties" and
26 did not intend to cover "a lump sum" as provided in the Rambus/Infineon settlement because the
27 parties expressly addressed "a lump sum" in the context of Amendment No. 1's provision
28 regarding a duty to negotiate a license renewal. Exh. 4240. The argument is not persuasive.

The 2001 Amendment was negotiated under different circumstances and at a different time, and

1 it does not address the meaning of "royalty rate" (including in the context of the most favored
2 licensee provision) or its application to flat payments, each one of which is payable on a
3 quarterly basis. More importantly, the extrinsic evidence unequivocally shows that Rambus
4 assured Samsung that no third party would get a better deal on the use of Rambus's DDR/SDR
5 technology than Samsung as Rambus desperately wanted and needed a deal with Samsung.

6 e. Other extrinsic evidence supports Rambus's intent to provide broad
7 most favored licensee protection to Samsung.

8 i. The customary meaning of the term "royalty rate" in patent
9 licenses includes various types of royalty payment structures, including a percentage of net sales,
10 a periodic, flat payment or variable flat payment per unit of time [REDACTED]..

11 ii. When comparing licensing terms, it is common in a wide variety of
12 industries, including with respect to patent licensing, to compare a running royalty with a
13 periodic, lump-sum royalty by calculating an effective royalty rate or by simply comparing the
14 lump sum amounts due on a quarterly basis for various types of royalty structures. Trial Tr. at
15 193:21-194:7, 614:3-616:3.

16 iii. [REDACTED]

17 iv. [REDACTED]

18 v. [REDACTED]

19 vi. In their joint press release created pursuant to the terms of the Infineon
20 Settlement and License Agreement, the parties described the quarterly payments agreed to be
21 paid by Infineon as the consideration granted "in exchange" for the license grant to Infineon, and
22 described the various dismissals and releases as "in addition to" these payments. *Id.*

23 vii. Rambus admitted in various filings with the Securities and Exchange
24 Commission that the Infineon Settlement and License Agreement contained a royalty rate in the
25 form of Infineon's quarterly payment obligation. Exh. 4450 (Rambus Inc. S.E.C. Form S-3/A,
26 dated May 11, 2005) at 7 ("[A]ll licenses provide that Infineon will be treated as a 'most-favored
27 customer' of ours which could result in Infineon's US \$5.85 million quarterly payment being
28 reduced if future Rambus licensees receive a lower royalty rate."); *id.* at 11 ("Failure to achieve
positive results in litigation will also result in a failure to trigger certain contractual provisions

1 which would convert certain flat rate royalty arrangements to per unit royalties. Any or all of
2 these adverse results could cause a substantial decline in our revenues."); *id.* at 13 ("...require
3 Infineon to pay us up to an additional \$100 Million in royalty payments."); Exh. 4451 (Rambus
4 Inc. S.E.C. Form 10-Q, dated May 9, 2006) at 39 ("Our license with Infineon, which was part of
5 our settlement, provides for the extension of certain benefits under that license to a successor in
6 interest that, under certain conditions, acquires all of Infineon's DRAM operations. If such an
7 acquisition were to occur, such successor would be entitled to the extension of such benefits,
8 including the ability to pay a royalty calculated by multiplying the Infineon rate by the
9 percentage increase in DRAM volume represented by the successor company's combined
10 operations. Such an extension of benefits could also make it more difficult for us to obtain the
11 royalty rates we believe are appropriate from the market as a whole. Such an extension of
12 benefits would, in addition, also operate to extend a release of claims to such successor, thus
13 reducing the number of companies to which we believe we are entitled to look for compensation
14 for the antitrust injury alleged by us in our pending San Francisco antitrust action."); *id.* at 46 ("...
15 . . . require Infineon to pay us up to an additional \$100 Million in royalty payments.") and 47 ("...
16 Infineon will be required to make additional royalty payments to us which may aggregate up to
17 \$100.0 million.").

18 g. Samsung's initial royalty rates, which were expressly subject to section 3.8 of
19 the SDR/DDR License, were calculated by multiplying Samsung's net sales of Licensed Products
20 by certain percentages (which ranged from .75% to 3.5% for SDR or DDR SDRAM). Exh. 4226
21 at § 3.1. Notably, Samsung's royalty payments were due on a calendar quarter basis and
22 therefore could be readily compared to different types of royalty structures that were likewise
23 due on a quarterly basis. *Id.* at § 4.2; Trial Tr. at 614:3-616:3. [REDACTED]

24 h. [REDACTED]

25 i. [REDACTED]

26 j. [REDACTED]

27 k. Samsung requested that Rambus make the Infineon royalty rate effective under
28 Section 3.8 of the 2000 SDR/DDR Agreement, but Rambus refused. Exh. 4268 (Letter from I.
Blumberg to J. Shim, dated Apr. 1, 2005) at 2; Trial Tr. at 961:2-6 ("I told Mr. Shim that the

Infineon Agreement involved a lump sum payment and that there was no royalty rate that would be comparable in any way or that would trigger Section 3.8 of that 2000 Agreement"), 1014:12-18 ("Mr. Shim said he wanted the Infineon deal and you said no; isn't that true? At that time, that is true."), 1021:2-8 ("I explained that there weren't any rates involved.").

l. Rambus informed Samsung that the Infineon Settlement and License Agreement did not contain a "royalty rate" because Infineon had agreed to pay a flat, quarterly payment as opposed to a variable payment based on a percentage of net sales. Trial Tr. at 961:2-6, 1021:2-8.

m. The evidence clearly establishes by more than a preponderance of the evidence that Section 3.8 of the SDR/DDR License was triggered by the Rambus/Infineon Settlement Agreement and that Rambus failed to fulfill its obligations to Samsung under Section 3.8.

2. The 2000 SDR/DDR License Did Not Cover DDR2 SDRAM and Subsequent Product Generations

Rambus and Samsung dispute whether the SDR/DDR License granted Samsung a license under certain Rambus patent claims to make and sell DDR2 SDRAM, GDDR3 SDRAM, and subsequent generations of products. The court finds as follows with respect to that dispute.

a. The SDR/DDR License granted Samsung a license under certain Rambus patent claims to make and sell a specifically defined set of "Licensed Products." Exh. 4226, §

1.2. The term "Licensed Product" is defined under the License:

1.7 "DDR SDRAM(s)" means the following current double data rate synchronous dynamic random access memory devices of Samsung, part numbers K4H280438B, K4H280838B, K4H281638B, K4H560438B, K4H560838B, K4H561638B, K4D62323HA, and K4D26328M. A copy of Samsung's data sheet for each of the above-identified part numbers will be provided by Samsung no later than November 24, 2000, made Exhibit 3 to this Agreement, and hereinafter referred to as "DDR SDRAM Data Sheets." "DDR SDRAM" further includes any double data rate synchronous dynamic random access memory device having (1) the primary function of information storage and (2) a specification (as set forth in the data sheet for the device) identical to any specification found in any one of the DDR SDRAM Data Sheets. "DDR SDRAM" additionally includes any future double data rate synchronous dynamic random access memory device which is identical to any device identified by the above part numbers but may have [1] a different package type, [2] different die size, [3] different burst type, [4] different clock frequency, [5] different programmable latency, [6] different programmable burst length, [7] different memory storage capacity, [8] different number of input/output pins, [9] different timing values for existing parameters (for example, set-up/hold times and propagation delays), [10] different power consumption,

and/or [11] different number of banks (as those terms are used in the attached DDR SDRAM Data Sheets) from those set forth in the DDR SDRAM Data Sheets. The parties agree that, if, at the discretion of the customer, a given device has the capability to operate as a (1) SDR SDRAM or SDR SGRAM and (2) DDR SDRAM or DDR SGRAM, that device, for purposes of this agreement, shall be deemed to be DDR SDRAM. The parties agree that each device of the above-identified part numbers is defined exclusively by its attached DDR SDRAM Data Sheet.

1.8 "DDR SGRAM(s)" means the following current double data rate synchronous graphics random access memory devices of Samsung, part number K4D623237M. A copy of Samsung's data sheet for the above-identified part number will be provided by Samsung no later than November 24, 2000, made Exhibit 4 to this Agreement, and hereinafter referred to as "DDR SGRAM Data sheet." "DDR SGRAM" further includes any future double data rate synchronous dynamic random access memory device having (1) the primary function of information storage and (2) a specification (as set forth in the data sheet for the device) identical to any specification found in the DDR SGRAM Data Sheet. "DDR SGRAM" additionally includes any future double data rate synchronous dynamic random access memory device which is identical to any device identified by the above part numbers but may have [1] a different package type, [2] different die size, [3] different burst type, [4] different clock frequency, [5] different programmable latency, [6] different programmable burst length, [7] different memory storage capacity, [8] different number of input/output pins, [9] different timing values for existing timing parameters (for example, set-up/hold times and propagation delays), [10] different power consumption, and/or [11] different number of banks (as those terms are used in the attached DDR SGRAM Data Sheet) from those set forth in the DDR SGRAM Data Sheet. The parties agree that the device of the above-identified part number is defined exclusively by its attached DDR SGRAM Data Sheet.

Id. §§ 1.7, 1.8.

b. Section 1.7 of the SDR/DDR License defines the term "DDR SDRAM."

Exh. 4226 § 1.7. DDR SDRAM is defined to include eight specific Samsung products, which are identified by their part numbers, "K4H280438B, K4H280838B, K4H2281638B, K4H560438B, K4H560838B, K4H561638B, K4D62323HA, and K4D263238M." *Id.*

c. The definition of DDR SDRAM also includes:

any future double data rate synchronous dynamic random access memory device which is identical to any device identified by the above part numbers but may have a different package type, different die size, different burst type, different clock frequency, different programmable latency, different programmable burst length, different memory storage capacity, different number of input/output pins, different timing values for existing timing parameters (for example, set-up/hold times and propagation delays), different power consumption, and/or different number of banks (as those terms are used in the attached DDR SDRAM Data Sheets) from those set forth in the DDR SDRAM Data Sheets.

Id.

d. Thus, the term "Licensed Products" in the SDR/DDR License encompasses

1 future DDR memory devices only if they are identical to the specific Samsung parts identified by
2 part number in Section 1.7 or differ only in a way described in the eleven allowed differences
3 enumerated in Section 1.7.

4 e. During negotiation of the SDR/DDR License Rambus's proposals only covered
5 narrow sets of specifically identified products. V103 (5/14/2008 Depo. of Charles Donohoe at
6 75:16-20); V102 (2/6/2001 Depo. of Charles Donohoe at 37:8-12, 99:16-100:9) (noting that
7 Rambus "wanted only certain specifically identifiable products to be covered by the agreement").

8 f. Rambus created the initial draft of the SDR/DDR License and sent it to
9 Samsung on August 10, 2000. Exhs. 4208, 4209. Section 1.7 was included in this original draft
10 of the SDR/DDR License in essentially the same form in which it appeared in the final executed
11 SDR/DDR License. Exh. 4209 at 4-5.

12 g. Samsung wanted the license agreement to cover "all products" and to obtain a
13 "complete peace accord with Rambus" so that it did not require "a continuing series of
14 negotiations as new products [came] on the market." V102 (2/6/2001 Depo. of Charles Donohoe
15 at 99:16-100:9); V103 (5/14/2008 Depo. of Charles Donohoe at 75:21-76:9). Rambus would not
16 give Samsung a total "peace accord." Instead, Rambus told Samsung that it did not want the
17 license "to cover future DRAM generations." V103 (5/14/2008 Depo. of Charles Donohoe at
18 75:16-20). Samsung's negotiators knew that DDR2 devices were not commercially available at
19 the time the SDR/DDR License was negotiated. Trial Tr. at 222-23 (testimony of J. Shim). In
20 fact, Samsung did not begin manufacturing DDR2 devices until two to three years after the
21 SDR/DDR License was executed. *Id.* at 223 (testimony of J. Shim).

22 h. Even though Samsung's attorneys knew that the company was developing
23 what would later become DDR2 devices at the time they negotiated the SDR/DDR License in
24 2000, and even though they knew that Rambus "did not want [the agreement] to cover future
25 DRAM generations," they never discussed "technical details" with Rambus during the course of
26 the negotiations. Trial Tr. at 357, 361 (testimony of J. Shim).

27 i. During the negotiations, Samsung tried to obtain broader language in Section
28 1.7. On October 16, 2000, Mr. Shim requested a revision of Section 1.7 and other clauses
defining the products licensed under the SDR/DDR License. Exh. 4215. With respect to the

1 licensing of future DDR SDRAM devices, Mr. Shim asked for the license to include products
2 "substantially similar" to the devices that were identified by specific Samsung part numbers, and
3 to substitute this broader phrase in place of the existing language, which licensed only future
4 products "identical" to the specific products identified by part number, except for eleven allowed
5 and enumerated differences. Exh. 4215 at 3.

6 j. Rambus did "not budge" on its proposed definition of the products that would
7 be covered under the SDR/DDR License and did not want the Agreement to cover future
8 products if Samsung "changed the products down the road." V102 (2/6/2001 Depo. of Charles
9 Donohoe at 100:3-9).

10 k. On October 16, 2000, Mr. Steinberg sent an email stating Rambus's position
11 that it was unwilling to amend the language of Section 1.7's limitation on future DDR memory
12 devices. Exh. 4216. His email explained that the existing provisions, including Section 1.7,
13 "adequately cover devices which may have evolutionary (as opposed to revolutionary)
14 differences from the devices specified by part number." Exh. 4216 at 1. Mr. Steinberg noted
15 that any coverage of evolutionary devices was limited to the eleven allowed differences in
16 Section 1.7, as drafted, *i.e.* if they were "identical to an identified device except for different
17 package type, different die size, etc." *Id.*

18 l. On October 27, 2000, Mr. Steinberg executed the SDR/DDR License on behalf
19 of Rambus. On October 31, 2000, Jon Kang executed the SDR/DDR License on behalf of
20 Samsung. Exh. 4226 at 28.

21 m. Section 1.7 of the final executed agreement was unchanged in all material
22 terms from the draft originally circulated by Mr. Steinberg on August 10, 2000. *Compare* Exh.
23 4209 at 4-5, *with* Exh. 4226 at 5-6. Trial Tr. at 363 (testimony of J. Shim) (agreeing that the
24 substantive language of Section 1.7 "was never modified from the original draft").

25 n. Although Mr. Steinberg told Mr. Shim that the language of Section 1.7 should
26 "adequately cover devices which may have evolutionary (as opposed to revolutionary)
27 differences from the devices specified by part number," the parties did not change the definition
28 of the products covered or even discuss what either meant by "evolutionary."

o. The SDR/DDR License defines licensed memory devices and their various

1 features by reference to "Samsung Data Sheets." Exh. 4226, §§ 1.5-1.8, 1.11. Thus, for
2 purposes of determining whether a "future double data rate synchronous dynamic random access
3 memory device" constitutes one of the "Licensed Products" within the meaning of the
4 agreement, the differences between the devices listed by part number and any such future
5 memory devices are appropriately determined by reference to their respective data sheets. *Id.* §
6 1.7; Trial Tr. at 854 (testimony of Sanjay Banerjee) (noting that "you have to read all these
7 [eleven] categories in the context of the earlier sentence, which is the specifications of the DDR
8 data sheet").

9 p. DDR2 memory devices are not "identical" to any DDR memory devices. Trial
10 Tr. at 529 (testimony of Carl Sechen); *id.* at 811-12 (testimony of Sanjay Banerjee).

11 q. Samsung's data sheets for its DDR2 memory devices are not "identical" to the
12 Samsung data sheets for any of the DDR memory devices listed by part number in Section 1.7.
13 Compare Exh. 4310 (64MB DDR), Exh. 4306 (256MB DDR) and Exh. 10265 (512MB DDR),
14 with Exh. 10248 (512MB DDR2), Exh. 4351 (512MB DDR2), and Exh. 10316 (1GB DDR2).
15 Trial Tr. at 529, 539-40 (testimony of Carl Sechen); *id.* at 821-22, 832-33, 836-37, 842-44, 846
16 (testimony of Sanjay Banerjee).

17 r. DDR2 is an "enhancement" over DDR memory devices, and DDR2 memory
18 devices contain a number of features, some of which are discussed in greater detail below, that
19 make them "substantially different" from the previous generation of DDR memory devices.
20 Trial Tr. at 468 (testimony of Carl Sechen); *id.* at 812-13 (testimony of Sanjay Banerjee). The
21 various enhancements included in DDR2 allowed memory devices to achieve a significantly
22 higher speed. Trial Tr. at 468 (testimony of Carl Sechen); *id.* at 812-13 (testimony of Sanjay
23 Banerjee).

24 s. DDR2 memory devices include features, including several features identified
25 as "key features" in Samsung's data sheets, that do not exist in DDR memory devices. Such "key
26 features" that are in DDR2 but are not in DDR include: (1) on-die termination, (2) off-chip driver
27 calibration, (3) differential data strobe; (4) posted CAS; and (5) programmable write latency.
28 E.g., Exh. 4351 at 3; Exh. 10248 at 3; Exh. 10316 at 4.

t. All five of these features identified as "key features" appear in Samsung's

1 DDR2 data sheets; none of these five features appears in Samsung's DDR data sheets. Compare
 2 Exh. 10265 at 4 (DDR), with Exh. 10248 at 3 (DDR2); Trial Tr. at 529 (testimony of Carl
 3 Sechen). At least three, on-die termination, off-chip driver calibration and differential data
 4 strobe do not qualify as allowed differences under the definitions of "DDR SDRAM" or "DDR
 5 SGRAM" under Sections 1.7 and 1.8 of the 2000 SDR/DDR License.

6 i. On-die termination is a new feature in DDR2. Trial Tr. at 479
 7 (testimony of Carl Sechen); *id.* at 812-18, 821-22 (testimony of Sanjay Banerjee). This
 8 difference between DDR2 and DDR is reflected in the Samsung Data Sheets. Compare Exh.
 9 10265 at 4 (DDR), with Exh. 10248 at 3 (DDR2). Exh. 10248 at 9 (DDR2 data sheet reflects
 10 addition of ODT pin), Exh. 10248 at 20-21 (DDR2 data sheet reflects addition of new
 11 ODT-related timing parameters); Exh. 10004 at 12-15; Trial Tr. at 821-24, 828 (testimony of
 12 Sanjay Banerjee). On-die termination reduces the "signal reflections" that are created when data
 13 is transmitted along the bus at very high rates. Exh. 4293 at 1. Without on-die termination,
 14 these signal reflections create "electrical discontinuities" that interfere with "signal integrity" and
 15 make processing information accurately difficult for the memory device. *Id.* at 1. With on-die
 16 termination, however, "[e]nhanced signal performance allows for higher data rates." *Id.* at 6. In
 17 other words, because on-die termination makes the signal transmitting the data clearer and
 18 therefore easier to read, it allows the system to process the data more quickly. *Id.* Although
 19 on-die termination enables or allows a memory device to operate more quickly, it does not
 20 necessarily require it to do so. Trial Tr. at 514-15 (testimony of Carl Sechen); *id.* at 817
 21 (testimony of Sanjay Banerjee). The addition of on-die termination requires changes in the
 22 circuitry and is more involved than simply changing the clock frequency. *Id.* at 514-15, 525
 23 (testimony of Carl Sechen). Either with or without on-die termination, a memory device can
 24 operate with a clock frequency of 200 megahertz (corresponding to a data rate of 400
 25 megahertz). Compare Exh. 10265 at 4 (DDR device operating with clock frequency of 200
 26 megahertz) with Exh. 10248 at 3 (DDR2 device operating with clock frequency of 200
 27 megahertz). Trial Tr. at 514-15 (testimony of Carl Sechen). Conversely, the clock frequency of
 28 a memory device can change without the addition of on-die termination. Exh. 4310 at 1 (64 MB
 DDR at 100, 125, 143, and 166 megahertz); Exh. 10265 at (512MB DDR at 333 and 400

1 megahertz); Trial Tr. at 807 (testimony of Sanjay Banerjee). On-die termination requires new
 2 timing parameters, improves the integrity of the signal, and reduces the number of errors in
 3 reading data. Trial Tr. at 818 (testimony of Sanjay Banerjee). Because on-die termination is a
 4 change from DDR technology that goes beyond a mere difference in clock frequency—and
 5 beyond any other variation permitted under Section 1.7—any device containing on-die
 6 termination, such as DDR2, is not a "Licensed Product" under the SDR/DDR License. Exh.
 7 4226 § 1.7.

8 ii. Off-chip driver calibration is a new feature in DDR2. Trial Tr. at 479
 9 (testimony of Carl Sechen); *id.* at 829-34 (testimony of Sanjay Banerjee). This difference
 10 between DDR2 and DDR is reflected in the Samsung data sheets. Compare Exh. 10265 at 4,
 11 with Exh. 10248 at 3; Exh. 10248 at 14 (DDR2 data sheet reflects addition of OCD and default
 12 characteristics); *id.* at 21 (DDR2 data sheet reflects addition of new OCD-related timing
 13 parameter); Exh. 10004 at 9-11; Trial Tr. at 832-33 (testimony of Sanjay Banerjee). Off-chip
 14 driver calibration increases the size of the "data eye" in a memory device, i.e. the time window
 15 during which a data bit can be read accurately (as either 0 or 1). Exh. 4295 at 1. Without
 16 off-chip driver calibration, variations in process, voltage, and temperature can narrow the
 17 window during which the data is valid. *Id.* at 1. This narrowing of the data eye can "impact
 18 signal integrity," making it difficult for the data to be read correctly. *Id.* at 2. Off-chip driver
 19 calibration helps to keep the data eye "wide" and "tall" and thereby maintain the "quality of the
 20 signaling environment." *Id.* at 1. It also helps to compensate for "variations" caused by the
 21 "manufacturing and assembly processes." *Id.* at 3. Because the signal is clearer and the data eye
 22 more stable, the system can operate at "higher communication speeds." *Id.* Off-chip driver
 23 calibration does enable or allow a memory device to operate more quickly but does not require it
 24 to do so. Trial Tr. at 514-15 (testimony of Carl Sechen); *id.* at 831 (testimony of Sanjay
 25 Banerjee). The addition of off-chip driver calibration necessitates a change in the memory
 26 device's circuitry. *Id.* at 514-15, 525 (testimony of Carl Sechen). The addition of off-chip driver
 27 calibration is more than just a change in frequency. In fact, either with or without off-chip driver
 28 calibration, a memory device can operate with a clock frequency of 200 megahertz
 (corresponding to a data rate of 400 megahertz). Compare Exh. 10265 at 4 (DDR device

operating with clock frequency of 200 megahertz) with Exh. 10248 at 3 (DDR2 device operating with clock frequency of 200 megahertz). Trial Tr. at 514-15 (testimony of Carl Sechen). Conversely, the clock frequency of a memory device can change without the addition of off-chip driver calibration. Exh. 4310 at 1 (64 MB DDR at 100, 125, 143, and 166 megahertz); Exh. 10265 at (512MB DDR at 333 and 400 megahertz); Trial Tr. at 807 (testimony of Sanjay Banerjee). The addition of off-chip driver calibration requires new timing parameters, creates a more "robust" signal, and as a result "produces fewer errors in the data." *Id.* at 831-33 (testimony of Sanjay Banerjee). Exh. 10248 at 14 (DDR2 data sheet reflects addition of OCD and default characteristics); *id.* at 21 (DDR2 data sheet reflects addition of new OCD-related timing parameter); Exh. 10004 at 9-11. Because off-chip driver calibration is a change from DDR technology that goes beyond a mere difference in clock frequency—and beyond any other variation identified in Section 1.7—any device containing off-chip driver calibration, such as DDR2, is not a "Licensed Product" under the SDR/DDR License.

iii. A differential data strobe is a new feature in DDR2. Trial Tr. at 479 (testimony of Carl Sechen); *id.* at 834-37 (testimony of Sanjay Banerjee). This difference between DDR2 and DDR is reflected in the Samsung data sheets. Compare Exh. 10265 at 4, with Exh. 10248 at 3; Exh. 10248 at 23; Trial Tr. at 836-37 (testimony of Sanjay Banerjee). A differential data strobe allows the memory device to read data bits (as either 0 or 1) at a "precise instance of time." *Id.* at 834. Without a differential data strobe, the memory device must rely on only a "single data strobe" and a timing reference (provided by the crossings of that data strobe with a voltage reference) which could "vary in the time domain." *Id.* This sort of variance gives rise to a problem known as "timing skew," meaning that there is uncertainty about when to "read in or write the data." *Id.* at 834-35. By contrast, with a differential data strobe, there are two "intersecting voltage wave forms." *Id.* at 835. The crossing points of these wave forms are less subject to timing skew and, therefore, provide a more exact "triggering" mechanism for the memory device to read or write the data. *Id.* at 835-36. The benefit of a differential data strobe is a wider "data eye" and greater accuracy. *Id.* at 836. A differential data strobe enables or allows a memory device to operate more quickly but does not require it to do so. Trial Tr. at 514-15 (testimony of Carl Sechen); *id.* at 835 (testimony of Sanjay Banerjee). It is not possible

1 to add a differential data strobe simply by changing the clock frequency. *Id.* (testimony of Carl
2 Sechen). *Cf. id.* at 525 (testimony of Carl Sechen). Either with or without a differential data
3 strobe, a memory device can operate with a clock frequency of 200 megahertz (corresponding to
4 a data rate of 400 megahertz). Compare Exh. 10265 at 4 (DDR device operating with clock
5 frequency of 200 megahertz) with Exh. 10248 at 3 (DDR2 device operating with clock
6 frequency of 200 megahertz). Trial Tr. at 514-15 (testimony of Carl Sechen). On the other
7 hand, the clock frequency of a memory device can change without the addition of a differential
8 data strobe. Exh. 4310 at 1 (64 MB DDR at 100, 125, 143, and 166 megahertz); Exh. 10265 at
9 (512MB DDR at 333 and 400 megahertz); Trial Tr. at 807 (testimony of Sanjay Banerjee).
10 Furthermore, a differential data strobe gives rise to differences other than a potential change in
11 clock frequency. In addition to enabling a potential increase in speed, the addition of a
12 differential data strobe creates a more "certain" timing mechanism, creates a larger "data eye," a
13 more "robust" signal, and as a result creates a more accurate process for "reading and writing
14 data." Trial Tr. at 835-36 (testimony of Sanjay Banerjee). Because a differential data strobe is a
15 change from DDR technology that goes beyond a mere difference in clock frequency—and
16 beyond any other variation identified in Section 1.7 – any device containing a differential data
17 strobe, such as DDR2, is not a "Licensed Product" under the SDR/DDR License.

18 u. Two of the new features in Samsung's DDR2 products, posted CAS and
19 programmable write latency, do appear to fall within the allowed category of a device with
20 "different programmable latency."

21 i. The Posted CAS enhancement in Samsung's DDR2, DDR3, and
22 GDDR2 products is characterized by the inclusion of an additive latency to the CAS delay to
23 make the command and data bus efficient for sustainable bandwidths. Trial Tr. at 502:12-503:11,
24 837:9-23. Using this approach, commands are issued externally but are held internally by the
25 device prior to execution, for the duration of the additive latency, in order to improve system
26 scheduling. Specifically, this method helps avoid collision on the command bus and gaps in data
27 input/output bursts, which improves delays. Additive latency is variable and is programmable.
28 Trial Tr. at 503:19-504:7, 837:24-838:14. Posted CAS appears to fit into the allowed difference
of "different programmable latency." Trial Tr. at 504:24-505:10.

1 ii. Programmable write latency is a new feature in DDR2. Trial Tr. at 479
2 (testimony of Carl Sechen); *id.* at 844-46 (testimony of Sanjay Banerjee). Programmable write
3 latency permits programmable adjustments to the amount of time between when the memory
4 device receives a write command and when it receives the data to be written. Trial Tr. at 844
5 (testimony of Sanjay Banerjee). In particular, programmable write latency was an improvement
6 on the "inflexible" DDR device, which fixed the write latency at "one clock cycle." *Id.* The
7 extra flexibility provided by programmable write latency helps the memory device avoid
8 "collisions or gaps" in the data to be written to the memory. *Id.* at 845-46. Among other things,
9 programmable write latency enables a memory device to operate more quickly but does not
10 require it to do so. *Id.* at 531 (testimony of Carl Sechen). Although a close question,
11 programmable write latency appears to fall into the allowed difference category of a "different
12 programmable latency" within the meaning of § 1.7. Rambus's argument that in the context of
13 the license agreement "different programmable latency" refers to different values for CAS
14 latency, a parameter that was already programmable in DDR, has some appeal. However, the
15 parties did not limit the difference of "programmable latency" to parameters already
16 programmable in DDR.

17 u. On-die termination, off-chip calibration and differential strobe are not
18 unrelated to clock frequency. As with many improvements to DRAM technology, the
19 "overriding objective" of these new features is to enable or allow the memory device to go faster.
20 Trial Tr. 523-24; 812-13. However, as noted above, a DDR SDRAM with one or more of these
21 enhancements is more than merely a DDR SDRAM which may have a different clock frequency.
22 The DDR2 products are not within the scope of the SDR/DDR License.

23 **3. Rambus Was Not Entitled to Terminate the 2000 SDR/DDR License on the**
24 **Purported Basis that Samsung Breached its Audit Obligation**

25 The parties dispute whether Rambus properly terminated the 2000 SDR/DDR
26 License on the basis that Samsung failed to comply with the audit requirements of the 2000
27 SDR/DDR License. The court makes the following findings of fact relevant to that issue.

28 a. The 2000 SDR/DDR Agreement contains an audit provision which

1 permits Rambus, through its designated independent accounting or licensing audit firm, to audit
 2 Samsung's records and information bearing upon the amount of royalties payable to Rambus
 3 under the 2000 SDR/DDR Agreement. Exh. 4226 (2000 SDR/DDR Agreement) § 4.1.

4 b. Specifically, Section 4.1 of the 2000 SDR/DDR Agreement reads:

5 With respect to the royalties set forth herein, Samsung shall keep complete
 6 and accurate records. These records shall be retained for a period of at least three
 7 (3) years from the date of payment, notwithstanding the expiration or other
 8 termination of this Agreement. Rambus, through its designated independent
 9 accounting or licensing audit firm, shall have the right to examine and audit, not
 10 more than once a year unless the preceding audit revealed an underpayment
 11 exceeding five percent (5%) of the total royalties due for the period under audit,
 12 and during normal business hours, all such records and such other records and
 13 accounts as may contain, under recognized accounting practices, information
 14 bearing upon the amount of royalties payable to Rambus under this Agreement. In
 15 no event will Rambus audit any given reporting period more than once. Prompt
 16 adjustment shall be made by Samsung to compensate for any errors and/or
 17 omissions disclosed by such examination or audit which result in an
 18 underpayment of royalties hereunder, together with interest thereon, from the date
 19 the payment was due at the 1 year U.S. Treasury bill (hereinafter "T-bill") rate, as
 20 published in the Wall Street Journal (Western Edition) on the date on which the
 21 royalty was due, plus five percent (5%) per annum (or the maximum allowed by
 22 applicable law, if less). Should the amount of any such error and/or omission
 23 exceed five percent (5%) of the total royalties due for the period under audit, then
 24 upon request by Rambus, Samsung shall pay for the cost of the audit. *If any three*
 25 *(3) consecutive audits reveal underpayments of royalties in excess of five percent*
 26 *(5%), Rambus shall be entitled to immediately terminate this Agreement on notice*
 27 *to Samsung at any time within ninety (90) days after such third such audit.* Should
 28 such audit disclose an overpayment of royalties hereunder, such overpayment
 shall be taken as a credit against future royalties, and in the event that there are no
 future royalties, Rambus shall issue a refund thereof.

Exh. 4226 (2000 SDR/DDR Agreement) at 19 (emphasis added).

19 c. In December 2003 Rambus requested an audit of Samsung under both Section
 20 4.1 of the 2000 SDR/DDR Agreement and Section 4.3(a) of the 1994 RDRAM Agreement. Trial
 21 Tr. at 256:8-14.

22 d. Rambus selected Ernst & Young to perform the Samsung audit. Trial Tr. at
 23 857:22-24. Nigel Shepherd of Ernst & Young's San Jose, California offices led the Samsung
 24 audit. Trial Tr. at 857:19-21.

25 e. Because the inspection of Samsung's records took place in Korea, and because
 26 Mr. Shepherd does not read or speak Korean, Mr. Shepherd did not personally participate in
 27 performing the Samsung audit. Trial Tr. at 877:20-878:5, 878:16-879:17, 881:12-25, 882:1-7,
 28 882:24-25.

1 f. Mr. Shepherd had a Korean team consisting of Simon Yoo and In-Sang Yoo
2 from Ernst & Young's Korean affiliate, Younghwa Accounting Firm, who performed the actual
3 audit work done at Samsung's Korean offices. Trial Tr. at 256:25-257:10, 878:6-12,
4 888:11-889:12.

5 g. During the audit, Samsung's primary contact was Ernst & Young's Korean
6 affiliate, Younghwa Accounting Firm. Trial Tr. at 257:10-15. Mr. Shepherd learned about the
7 on-site audit visits and communications between Younghwa Accounting Firm and Samsung
8 through his telephone and e-mail communications with Simon Yoo and In-Sang Yoo of
9 Younghwa Accounting Firm. Mr. Shepherd communicated his understanding regarding the
10 progress of the audit to William Deley, his primary contact at Rambus. Trial Tr. at 858:12-13,
11 883:7-10.

12 h. On July 9, 2004, Rambus made a presentation to Samsung in which it claimed
13 that "[l]ack of data has now delayed this audit 7+ months" and that "[s]uch delay is a breach of
14 our RDRAM, SDRAM, and DDR licenses." Exh. 4251 (Samsung-Rambus Legal Update
15 Presentation, dated July 9, 2004). In this presentation, as part of the "Proposed Next Steps -
16 Closure," Rambus requested that Samsung provide audit data from October 1, 2000 through
17 March 31, 2004. Exh. 4251 (Samsung-Rambus Legal Update Presentation, dated July 9, 2004) at
18 14.

19 i. Mr. Shepard participated in two conference calls with Samsung and Rambus in
20 July 2004. Trial Tr. at 905:13-15. These conference calls took place after the July 9, 2004
21 meeting between Samsung and Rambus. Exh. 10228 (Memorandum from N. Shepherd to File re:
22 Samsung Rambus Conference Call, dated Nov. 23, 2004) (the "Background" provided in N.
23 Shepherd's November 23, 2004 memorandum to file states, "[t]he purpose of the call was to
24 follow up on the four issues raised at the July 15, 2004 conference call and subsequently
25 documented in the memorandum dated 7_28_04."). Mr. Shepherd's November 23, 2004
26 Memorandum to File states, "[c]urrently, the audit period has covered 1/1/2001 through to
27 12/31/2003 following discussions with E&Y and Samsung." Exh. 10228 (Memorandum from N.
28 Shepherd to File re: Samsung Rambus Conference Call, dated Nov. 23, 2004).

j. The Amendment No. 1 to the 2000 SDR/DDR Agreement dictated the royalties

1 that Samsung owed to Rambus from January 1, 2001 through April 1, 2005. Exh. 4240 (2001
2 Amendment); Trial Tr. at 249:22-250:2. Under Amendment No. 1, Samsung paid Rambus a
3 "lump sum royalty" of \$3,800,000 in satisfaction of all of its royalty obligations for the first
4 quarter of 2001 for both memory and memory controller sales. Exh. 4240 (Amendment No. 1) §
5 2. Samsung thereafter paid a "fixed, lump sum royalty" of \$2,000,000 every quarter "in lieu of
6 the royalty" required by the 2000 Agreement "for the Memory Products." *Id.* §§ 3, 5; Trial Tr. at
7 251:3-15, 252:1-7.

8 k. Because the only royalties paid on a per-unit basis under the 2000 SDR/DDR
9 Agreement from January 1, 2001 through December 31, 2003 were memory controllers, the audit
10 concerned RDRAM Products and SDR/DDR Controllers. Trial Tr. at 251:3-15, 252:1-7,
11 259:21-260:1.

12 l. During the audit, Younghwa Accounting Firm visited Samsung several times
13 between the spring of 2004 and the early part of 2005. Trial Tr. at 258:4-7.

14 m. During 2004, there were several occasions when Mr. Deley at Rambus
15 instructed Mr. Shepherd not to pursue further information from Samsung, and not to contact
16 Samsung. Trial Tr. at 860:15-20, 883:11-13. When Mr. Deley at Rambus asked Mr. Shepherd
17 not to contact Samsung, Mr. Shepard would inform his Korean team at Younghwa Accounting
18 Firm that they, too, should not initiate contact with Samsung. Trial Tr. at 885:9-16. During the
19 times when Rambus asked Mr. Shepherd not to contact Samsung, nothing was being done to
20 proceed with the audit. Trial Tr. at 885:5-21.

21 n. One of the occasions that Mr. Deley instructed Mr. Shepherd not to
22 contact Samsung was in September of 2004. V100 (Video Testimony of W. Deley) at
23 71:17-72:2. On October 4, 2004 Mr. Shepherd sent Mr. Deley an email inquiring whether Ernst
24 & Young was "supposed to hold off on any follow-up with Samsung." Trial Exhibit 4252 (Email
25 from N. Shepherd to W. Deley, dated Oct. 4, 2004) ("are we [Ernst & Young] still supposed to
26 hold off on any follow-up with Samsung?"); Trial Tr. at 884:22-25, 886:2-7; V100 (Video
27 Testimony of W. Deley) at 69:22-70:2. Between October 4, 2004 and November 13, 2004
28 neither Ernst & Young nor Younghwa Accounting Firm had made any effort to "move the

1 [Samsung] audit forward" due to instruction from Rambus not to initiate contact with Samsung.
2 Trial Tr. at 885:1-21, 886:2-7.

3 o. On November 13, 2004, Rambus instructed Mr. Shepherd to set up a
4 conference call with Samsung about the audit. Trial Tr. at 888:2-6. Around the middle of
5 December 2004, In-Sang Yoo of Younghwa Accounting Firm conducted a site visit of
6 Samsung's offices in Korea. Trial Tr. at 888:11-18, 889:3-7. Mr. Shepherd was not personally
7 present at this site visit, but he learned about it from an email sent by Simon Yoo who similarly
8 was not present. Trial Tr. at 888:21-889:12.

9 p. After In-Sang Yoo's mid-December 2004 site visit, Mr. Shepherd reported to
10 Rambus that Samsung was not going to deal with Ernst & Young again. Trial Tr. at 889:13-25.

11 q. As of January 18, 2005, Mr. Shim understood that Samsung had provided all
12 the documents necessary to complete the audit and further understood that Younghwa
13 Accounting Firm expressed that there were no more outstanding issues with respect to the
14 audit. Trial Tr. at 285:8-15 (admissible only to show Mr. Shim's understanding). Mr. Shim
15 understood that Younghwa Accounting Firm would contact Samsung's accounting department if
16 the firm had a need for further documents. Trial Tr. at 285:16-19.

17 r. During a February 2, 2005 meeting between the parties, Mr. Shim remarked
18 that the Ernst & Young Korean auditors confirmed with Samsung that they had what they needed
19 for the audit and did not require further information. Trial Tr. at 286:12-22; Exh. 4260 (Jared
20 Smith's handwritten notes from a February 2, 2005 Samsung-Rambus meeting) ("Heard from
21 local audit team that things were okay").

22 s. After Younghwa Accounting Firm visited Samsung on January 18, 2005,
23 neither it nor Ernst & Young made any further requests of Samsung for materials, information or
24 assistance. Trial Tr. at 286:8-16.

25 t. Rambus made a proposal to Samsung for a renewal of the 2000 SDR/DDR
26 Agreement on February 20, 2005. Exh. 4263 (Email from I. Blumberg to J. Shim re: DRAM).

27 u. In February 2005, Rambus continued to accept royalty reports and payments
28 from Samsung. Trial Tr. at 255-256; Exh. 4429 (Samsung 4Q 2004 Royalty Statement, dated
Feb. 17, 2005).

1 v. Between January of 2005 and March of 2005, Rambus did not ask Ernst &
 2 Young to contact Samsung. Trial Tr. at 891:21-24. Then, on March 18, 2005, the day Rambus
 3 settled with Infineon, Mr. Deley sent Mr. Shepherd an email requesting that he "confirm that
 4 there has been zero continued cooperation by Samsung relative to the royalty audit." Trial Tr. at
 5 890:1-6; Exh. 4264 (Settlement and License Agreement between Rambus and Infineon, effective
 6 March 18, 2005).

7 x. Mr. Deley's Infineon-Settlement-Day email informed Mr. Shepherd that
 8 Samsung has "been saying that they have been fully cooperating on the audit. Please confirm the
 9 facts, i.e., update your status." Trial Tr. at 890:16-891:12. After Mr. Deley's March 18, 2005
 10 request that Mr. Shepherd "confirm that there has been zero continued cooperation by Samsung
 11 relative to the royalty audit," Mr. Blumberg sent a letter to Mr. Shim on April 1, 2005 stating:

12 since the royalty rate per the terms of the Agreement are based on per unit
 13 calculations, please advise your accounting group as soon as possible that it will
 14 need to track sales of all licensed DRAMs in order to provide timely the quarterly
 15 reports required by section 4.2 of the Agreement and to pay the corresponding
 16 royalties. This report is likely to be complex due to the itemized data required. As
 17 you recall, there are ongoing accounting issues that we have notified you
 18 constitute an uncured breach of the Agreement and we would like to avoid any
 19 additional problems.

20 Exh. 4268 (Letter from I. Blumberg to J. Shim, dated Apr. 1, 2005) at 2. Notably, in the same
 21 April 1 letter, Mr. Blumberg told Mr. Shim: "I believe it would be in the best interest of both our
 22 companies to initiate substantive discussions regarding renewal and expansion of license
 23 coverage as soon as possible. As you know, renewal discussions are also required by § 8.5 of the
 24 Agreement." *Id.*

25 y. After Mr. Blumberg sent this April 1, 2005 letter, he sent an email to
 26 Mr. Deley explaining he "desperately need[s]" a detailed summary of the status of Rambus's
 27 royalty audit with Samsung due to an unexpected meeting with Mr. Shim of Samsung. Exh.
 28 10260 (Email from N. Shepherd to W. Deley re: Samsung Audit Issues, dated Apr. 6, 2005)
 ("Jared and I are meeting Jay Shim of Samsung rather unexpectedly in about 36 hours. I need a
 detailed summary of the status of our royalty audit with Samsung Sorry for the short notice,
 but I desperately need this information no later than 24 hours from now. Thanks for your help,
 Ira."). Mr. Deley forwarded Mr. Blumberg's email to Mr. Shepherd on April 5, 2005, stating:

1 "Nigel, this is an important issue. We need a basic update on the issues." Trial Tr. at 893:13-15;
2 Exh. 10260 (Email from N. Shepherd to W. Deley, dated Apr. 6, 2005)

3 z. In response to Rambus's March 18th and April 5th requests, Mr.
4 Shepherd sent Rambus an email update on the audit on April 6, 2005. Trial Tr. at 894:21-24;
5 Exh. 10260 (Email from Nigel Shepherd to William Deley, dated April 6, 2005). That email did
6 not include any information about the January 18, 2005 visit by Younghwa Accounting Firm.
7 Exh. 10260 (Email from N. Shepherd to W. Deley, dated Apr. 6, 2005). Most of the information
8 contained in Mr. Shepherd's April 6, 2005 email is derived from "updates from his field team"
9 which include conversations Mr. Shepherd had with Simon Yoo and In Sang Yoo of the
10 Younghwa Accounting Firm, or Excel tracking spreadsheets sent to him by email and, last
11 updated "sometime" in September of 2004. Trial Tr. at 906:5-907:1, 907:11-908:2. It had been
12 at least three months since Mr. Shepherd had spoken with anyone from Samsung. Trial Tr. at
13 891:18-24; Ex. 10260 (Email from N. Shepard to W. Deley dated April 6, 2005).

14 aa. Rambus never told Samsung that there was any basis for it not to
15 negotiate in good faith for a mutually satisfactory patent license until June 3, 2005. Trial Tr. at
16 1041:1-8.

17 bb. Rambus accepted Samsung's royalty payments for Q1 2005 on May
18 24, 2005. Trial Tr. at 255-256; Exh. 4430 (Samsung's Royalty Statement for 1Q, 2005, dated
19 May 23, 2005).

20 cc. On June 6, 2005 Rambus purported to terminate the 2000 SDR/DDR
21 Agreement citing Samsung's "failure to comply with the auditing provisions of Section 4[.]"
22 Trial Tr. at 304:5-14; 305:5-8; Exh. 4276 (Letter from J. Danforth to J. Shim, dated June 6,
23 2005) ("[d]espite having ample opportunity to cure since receiving written notice, Samsung still
24 has not complied with these auditing provisions. This letter is to inform you that in view of
25 Samsung's continued breach and failure to cure . . . Rambus hereby immediately terminates the
26 SDR/DDR License Agreement.").

27 dd. Rambus did not offer in evidence any exhibits that were delivered to
28 Samsung before Rambus terminated the 2000 SDR/DDR License that revealed the
underpayment by Samsung of royalties in excess of five percent for three consecutive audits nor

1 did Rambus introduce any audit papers prepared by the Younghwa Accounting Firm. Rambus's
 2 purported termination of the 2000 SDR/DDR License for Samsung's alleged failure to comply
 3 with its audit obligations appears to have been for strategic purposes and the failure to comply
 4 was a pretextual reason given for the termination..

5 **4. The Failure of the Parties to Negotiate an Extension to the SDR/DDR**
 6 **Agreement or a Mutually Satisfactory New License Agreement Was Not**
 7 **Caused by Any Lack of Good Faith**

8 The parties dispute (1) whether Rambus breached its duty to negotiate in good
 9 faith an extension of the SDR/DDR License or a new patent license agreement to replace the
 10 SDR/DDR License, (2) whether the good faith provision is definite enough to be enforced and
 11 (3) what the appropriate remedy is, if Rambus did breach an enforceable duty. The court makes
 the following factual findings with respect to these issues.

12 a. Section 8.5 of the 2000 SDR/DDR License provides:

13 8.5 Assuming that this Agreement has not been terminated and that Samsung
 14 is not in breach hereof, the parties shall meet, six (6) months before the expiration
 15 of this Agreement, to negotiate in good faith with a view to achieving a mutually
 16 satisfactory patent license agreement under the Rambus Patents with respect to
 the Licensed Products, including, without limitation, an extension hereof or a new
 agreement.

17 *Id.* § 8.5. 186.

18 b. The negotiation history of the 2000 SDR/DDR License shows that the parties
 19 never agreed that any extension or renewal would be one that gave Samsung some form of most
 20 favored licensee status. On August 10, 2000, Mr. Steinberg sent a draft license agreement to Mr.
 21 Shim. That draft did not contain any obligation to negotiate a renewal or extension in good faith,
 22 or any provision that contained language resembling what was eventually adopted as Section 8.5.
 23 Exhs. 4208, 4209.

24 c. On October 6, 2000, Mr. Shim sent a proposed term sheet to Mr. Steinberg that
 25 requested that Mr. Steinberg add a provision in which Rambus would agree that the parties
 26 would negotiate in good faith any extension or renewal terms to the present Agreement, and that
 27 the royalty terms of such extension or renewal terms would not exceed the present royalty terms.
 28 Under such a provision, the parties could further negotiate in good faith terms relating to any
 additional patents or licensed products. Exh. 4214 at ¶ 9 (emphasis added).

1 d. A few days later, on October 11, 2000, Mr. Steinberg incorporated some but
2 not all of Samsung's suggested provisions for what became Section 8.5 in the draft agreement.
3 Exh. 4217 (red-lines within for October 11, 2000 draft). Specifically, the language in the
4 October 11, 2000 draft said nothing about royalty terms for an extension or renewal not
5 exceeding "the present royalty terms" in Section 3.1 of the license under discussion. *Id.*

6 e. On October 16, 2000, Mr. Shim responded with suggested revisions to the
7 October 11, 2000 draft. Mr. Shim copied Charles Donohoe, Samsung's counsel, on those
8 communications. Before sending the October 16 proposed revisions, Mr. Shim consulted with
9 Mr. Donohoe. V105 (6/9/2008 Depo. of Jay Shim at 205:21-206:6). Mr. Shim asked that
10 Section 3.8, the most favored licensee provision in the draft agreement, be included in the list of
11 provisions that would survive termination or expiration of the agreement. Exh. 4215 at ¶ 17.

12 f. That same day, Mr. Steinberg responded and did not include Section 3.8 in
13 the list of provisions that would survive termination or expiration of the agreement. Exh. 4216, ¶
14 17; Exh. 4217, § 8.6 (no revision to include 3.8).

15 g. On October 21, 2000, Mr. Steinberg sent an executed SDR/DDR License to
16 Mr. Shim. Exh. 4222.

17 h. On October 26, 2000, Mr. Shim sent an email to Mr. Steinberg, in which Mr.
18 Shim requested four changes. Specifically, Mr. Shim requested (1) that the arbitration procedure
19 be removed from the agreement, (2) *a "representation" from Mr. Steinberg "that 'Rambus*
20 *Patents' in Section 1.12(i) are intended to cover all Licensed Products and their future*
21 *parametrically improved versions,"* (3) *"8.5 to reflect that in the 'extension' or 'new agreement,'*
22 *Samsung is guaranteed to the most favorable royalty condition in the manner afforded in the*
23 *present agreement,"* and (4) that the termination period in Section 8.4 change to thirty days from
24 sixty days for both parties. Exh. 4223 (Emphasis added).

25 i. The next day, on October 27, 2000, Mr. Steinberg sent a revised, signed
26 SDR/DDR License. Mr. Steinberg stated in his letter that "to the extent possible, we have
27 incorporated your latest requests into the enclosed Agreement." Exh. 4224 at 2. Mr. Steinberg
28 incorporated two of Mr. Shim's four suggested revisions. First, the arbitration procedure in
Section 9.3 was removed. Compare Exh. 4222, § 9.3 with Exh. 4224 at 26-27. Second, the

1 termination period in Section 8.4 was changed to thirty days from sixty days. Compare Exh.
2 4222, § 8.4 with Exh. 4224, § 8.4. The revised, signed October 27, 2000 document did not
3 incorporate Mr. Shim's requested changes for Section 1.12(i) or Section 8.5. Specifically, it
4 made no change to Section 8.5 to provide that in any extension or new agreement, Samsung
5 would be guaranteed any most favorable royalty conditions.

6 j. On October 31, 2000, Mr. Shim called Mr. Steinberg. Exh. 4227. Mr.
7 Shim followed up that phone call with an email to Mr. Steinberg at 1:48 a.m. on October 31,
8 2000 that said Jon Kang had executed the SDR/DDR License. *Id.* Moreover, it said: "I'm now
9 working on Section 8.5 (i.e., the most favorable royalty condition in the extension or in new
10 agmt.) wording and will have that for you soon. As you indicated we'll attach a post-execution
11 amendment to resolve this." *Id.*

12 k. The SDR/DDR License was signed by Jon Kang of Samsung on October 31,
13 2000 without modification of Section 8.5. Exh. 4226. The language in Section 8.5 in the final
14 SDR/DDR License is the same as the language proposed by Rambus on October 11, 2000.
15 Compare Exh. 4217, § 8.5 (no red-line indicates language is same as October 11, 2000 draft)
16 with Exh. 4226 § 8.5.

17 l. On November 7, 2000, Mr. Shim sent Mr. Steinberg a draft Amendment A to
18 the SDR/DDR License. Exh. 4230. Samsung's draft Amendment A provided that Section 8.5
19 would be amended to add the following language: "Rambus agrees that in such an extension or a
20 new agreement, the royalty rates, such as the ones specified in Section 3.1 herein, or effective
21 royalty rates shall in no event be greater than those agreed to by any other then current or
22 prospective licensees of Rambus for substantially similar categories of licensed products." Exh.
23 4231.

24 m. On November 21, 2000, Mr. Steinberg replied to Mr. Shim's November 7,
25 2000 email and said "[a]ttached please find a revised amendment to the Patent License
26 Agreement." Exh. 4232. In the attached revised amendment, Mr. Steinberg proposed different
27 language to be added to Section 8.5: "Rambus agrees that in such an extension or a new
28 agreement, the royalty rates for any category of products corresponding to SDR SDRAM, SDR
SGRAM, DDR SDRAM and DDR SGRAM shall not be greater than the royalty rates paid by

1 other current or prospective licensees under the Rambus Patents for any category of products
2 corresponding to SDR SDRAM, SDR SGRAM, DDR SDRAM, and DDR SGRAM." Exh.
3 4233.

4 n. Neither of the proposed amendments to Section 8.5 reflected in Exhibits 4231
5 or 4233 was ever signed by either party. Trial Tr. at 248:19-22. Therefore, those proposed
6 provisions were not incorporated into the SDR/DDR License either expressly or impliedly
7 because Section 10.9 requires any "alteration, amendment, waiver, cancellation or any other
8 change in any term or condition of [the] Agreement . . . [to] have been mutually assented to in
9 writing by both parties." Exh. 4226, § 10.9.

10 o. Samsung never agreed to any amendment to Section 8.5 because, as Mr.
11 Shim related, Samsung believed "about this time, and for the period of many months that
12 followed, there were some serious concerns as to Rambus's I.P., and we were reviewing many
13 different aspects of lawsuits that were going on." Trial Tr. at 248:28-249:3. Not signing the
14 amendment because of uncertainty on Samsung's side suggests that Samsung made a conscious
15 decision not to sign any amendment due to its uncertainty as to a future relationship with
16 Rambus and thus not wanting to commit itself further. Although Mr. Shim claimed at trial that
17 the amendment was important to Samsung, his testimony before trial that he had no recollection
18 whatsoever of any effort by him or anyone at Samsung to change Section 8.5 from October 27
19 through the end of 2000 makes suspect his trial testimony of its importance. V105 (6/9/2008
20 Depo. of J. Shim at 143:20-144:13, 239:5-10).

21 p. Mr. Shim acknowledged in an August 2005 evidentiary hearing that Samsung
22 did not have any most favored licensee protection for any extension of the SDR/DDR License or
23 in any new agreement that replaced or followed it, but rather that the most favored licensee
24 provisions of Section 3.8 were limited to the five-year term of the SDR/DDR License.
25 Specifically, Mr. Shim testified that the SDR/DDR License "provided a most favored nations
26 clause while it was in effect, but it did not provide any commitment on Rambus's part that
27 Samsung would be given a most favored nation clause in a renewal agreement." He further
28 elaborated that the SDR/DDR License "provided most favored nation during those terms.

Obviously, we did not talk about terms of the renewal." Trial Tr. at 928:21-929:16.

1 q. Mr. Donohoe testified that Samsung "would not have wanted an exact
2 extension of the agreement" but rather would have "wanted to be able to renegotiate the
3 economic terms of the agreement." He further explained: "So I don't think [Samsung] asked for
4 an out and out extension of the agreement." V103 (5/14/08 Depo. of Charles Donohoe at
5 133:1-11).

6 r. In May 2001, after the initial verdict adverse to Rambus in the Infineon
7 litigation, Samsung told Rambus it intended to withhold its first quarter 2001 royalty payments
8 while it evaluated the litigation. Trial Tr. at 735:15-22; Exhs. 9109, 9112.

9 s. In the following weeks, the parties negotiated Amendment No. 1 to the
10 SDR/DDR License, effective July 11, 2001. Exh. 4240. In Paragraph 8 of Amendment No. 1,
11 Rambus and Samsung agreed as follows:

12 Assuming that the Agreement, as revised herein, has not been terminated
13 and that Samsung is not in breach thereof, the parties shall meet six (6) months
14 before the expiration of the Agreement, to negotiate in good faith with a view to
15 achieving a mutually satisfactory patent license agreement under the Rambus
16 Patents with respect to the Licensed Products, including, without limitation, an
17 extension of the Agreement or a new agreement. Rambus agrees that in such an
18 extension or a new agreement, the royalty rates for SDR/DDR IC's and/or
19 SDR/DDR memory modules *shall not be greater than the royalty rates paid by
20 other current or prospective licensees and further shall not be greater than the
21 royalty rate as specified under Section 3.1 of the Agreement*, in the event that
22 Rambus receives a lump sum payment, in lieu of royalties calculated based on a
23 percentage of Net Sales, on Licensed Products from another licensee prior to
24 termination or expiration of the Agreement, then the parties agree to negotiate in
25 good faith to modify the payment terms of the Agreement.

26 Exh. 4240, ¶ 8 (emphasis added). The italicized language was added to Paragraph 8 of the 2001
27 Amendment, and is not present in Section 8.5 of the SDR/DDR License. Compare Exh. 4226, §
28 8.5, with Exh. 4240, ¶ 8. The addition of this language in Amendment No. 1 suggests that an
obligation to agree to most favored licensee rates is not implicit in the duty to negotiate in good
faith or else the additional language would be mere surplusage.

 t. Amendment No. 1 also provided that "[i]n the event that Rambus licenses . . .
Infineon AG, then anytime after March 31, 2002, Rambus may terminate this Amendment No. 1
upon (10) days written notice from Rambus to Samsung of the license . . . and the terms of the
Agreement shall resume in force thereafter." *Id.* at ¶ 7.

 u. By at least July 2004, Rambus pressed Samsung to begin renewal negotiations

1 for a license that would replace or follow the expiration of the SDR/DDR License.

2 v. Samsung and Rambus met on July 9, 2004 in Korea. Rambus's attendees
3 included Mr. Blumberg, Jared Smith, John Danforth, and Joe Moniz. Samsung's attendees
4 included Mr. Shim and some of his associates. Trial Tr. at 259:3-17, 945:22-946:6.240.

5 x. Rambus made a PowerPoint presentation to Mr. Shim and the other Samsung
6 attendees at this July 9, 2004 meeting. Trial Tr. at 258:15-18; Exh. 4251. Rambus presented its
7 position on why the SDR/DDR License did not cover DDR2. Trial Tr. at 946:7-16. Rambus set
8 forth its explanation of the contractual language in Sections 1.7 and 1.12 of the SDR/DDR
9 License and why the language did not cover DDR2 and subsequent generation products. Exh.
10 4251 at 46-49. Mr. Blumberg, invited Samsung to respond at the meeting with its position on
11 DDR2. *Id.* at 45; Trial Tr. at 946:17-20, 950:11-12. However, Mr. Shim did not offer any
12 explanation based on the contractual language or any other documents to show why DDR2 and
13 subsequent generation products were covered by the agreement. Trial Tr. at 947:1-14. Mr.
14 Blumberg encouraged Mr. Shim to begin renewal negotiations because the SDR/DDR License
15 and its Amendment No. 1 were set to expire in 2005. Mr. Blumberg testified that "as early as
16 that July 9th 2004 meeting," he "mentioned to Mr. Shim my concern that renewal negotiations
17 for agreements of this complexity typically took a significant amount of time and suggested that
18 we begin discussions of that renewal as quickly as possible to ensure that we didn't run out of
19 time to renew the agreement before the 2000 agreement expired." Trial Tr. at 950:25-953:6. In
20 response to Mr. Blumberg's desire to get the renewal negotiations started in 2004, Mr. Shim's
21 position was that there was "no need to rush." Mr. Shim told Mr. Blumberg that it was
22 premature to begin negotiations because those negotiations were not required until six months
23 before the expiration of the agreement, and Mr. Shim's interpretation of Amendment No. 1 was
24 that it did not expire until October 2005. Trial Tr. at 951:13-952:21. In response, Mr. Blumberg
25 tried to encourage Mr. Shim to negotiate because Mr. Blumberg "[felt] strongly that it was going
26 to take more than six months to negotiate a renewal." *Id.* at 953:1-4.

27 y. From July 9, 2004 to February 20, 2005, Mr. Blumberg continued to press Mr.
28 Shim to begin renewal negotiations. Trial Tr. at 950:25-953:6.

z. On February 20, 2005, Mr. Blumberg sent an offer for renewal to Mr. Shim.

1 Trial Tr. at 950:13-22; Exh. 4263 (the "February 20 Renewal Offer"). Rambus's February 20
2 Renewal Offer to Samsung proposed that Samsung make fixed quarterly payments of \$12
3 million in return for a license covering "all forms of DRAM, current and future." The offer
4 contained a trigger that would move the fixed quarterly payments to a "market rate once at least
5 one other major DRAM manufacturer is paying such market rates." Exh. 4263.

6 aa. Mr. Shim testified that he did not "have a chance" to respond to the February
7 20 Renewal Offer. Trial Tr. at 289:21-24 ("I did not get a chance to address this proposal"),
8 320:2-4 ("I don't think I ever had a chance to respond to this proposal"), 333:21-23 ("We never
9 got a chance to respond to that."). However, Mr. Shim had more than two weeks to consider the
10 February 20 Renewal Offer before he met in person with Mr. Blumberg, Mr. Danforth, and Mr.
11 Smith on March 8, 2008 at Rambus's offices in Los Altos, California. Trial Tr. at 953:14-22.
12 Then, at the March 8 meeting, Mr. Shim had further opportunity to discuss, consider, and
13 evaluate the February 20 Renewal Offer. At this March 8 meeting, Rambus orally presented the
14 Offer. Trial Tr. at 953:23-954:3. In response, Mr. Shim said "it was too early to get into hard
15 core renewal negotiations as we were still well beyond the six-month period before the end of
16 October." *Id.* at 954:6-10. Mr. Blumberg explained to Mr. Shim that it was a "sweetheart deal"
17 compared to the amount that Samsung would owe going forward under the running royalty rates
18 in Section 3.1 of the SDR/DDR License, and Mr. Blumberg explained to Mr. Shim that the
19 February 20 Renewal process information accurately Offer was time-sensitive and would be
20 withdrawn if Rambus settled the ongoing litigation with Infineon. *Id.* at 954:17-956:1.
21 Specifically, Mr. Blumberg testified that "I made it clear that this offer was only good until such
22 time as the Infineon settlement occurred." *Id.* at 955:24-956:1. Mr. Blumberg explained that
23 Rambus was in a trial with Infineon that was expected to finish at the end of March, that there
24 was a possibility Rambus would lose its trial with Infineon, and Rambus would be willing to
25 appeal the Infineon loss if it had an agreement in place with Samsung. Trial Tr. at 955:7-956:1.
26 However, Mr. Blumberg told Mr. Shim that if the Samsung agreement was not in place, then
27 Rambus was likely to settle with Infineon, "in which case Rambus would no longer see a value
28 to offering a sweetheart deal to Samsung." *Id.* at 955:19-23. Mr. Blumberg explained to Mr.
Shim: "... I believe it would be in the best interest of both our companies to initiate substantive

1 discussions regarding renewal and expansion of license coverage as soon as possible." Exh.
2 4268 at 2. Further, Mr. Blumberg told Mr. Shim that he would be in Tokyo the week of April 5-
3 9 and if "you are available in Tokyo during that time, I would be happy to arrange my schedule
4 to meet with you." Exh. 4268 at 2.

5 bb. On March 21, 2005, Rambus and Infineon signed a settlement agreement.
6 Exh. 4264. On March 22, 2005, Mr. Blumberg sent a facsimile to Mr. Shim informing him of
7 the settlement and attaching a copy of a press release containing certain information. Exh. 4265.
8 Mr. Blumberg's March 22, 2005 letter also gave notice that Rambus was terminating the 2001
9 Amendment per the terms of the Amendment. *Id.* Ten days after notice, the governing
10 agreement was again the 2000 SDR/DDR License.

11 cc. On March 24, 2005, Mr. Shim wrote to Mr. Blumberg and requested a copy
12 of the Infineon Settlement Agreement. Exh. 4267.

13 dd. Mr. Blumberg declined to provide Mr. Shim a copy of the Infineon
14 Settlement Agreement based upon Rambus's confidentiality obligations to Infineon. Trial Tr. at
15 957:7-10; Exh. 4264 (Infineon Settlement Agreement ¶ 12.3). Mr. Blumberg explained to Mr.
16 Shim this restriction on his ability to share the agreement. Trial Tr. at 957:7-10; Exh. 4268 at 1
17 ("Since these agreements are confidential, I cannot disclose any such agreement to you as you
18 have requested."). However, in addition to sending Mr. Shim the press release describing the
19 Infineon settlement, Mr. Blumberg did later answer Mr. Shim's questions about the Infineon
20 Settlement Agreement after the agreement was signed. Trial Tr. at 957:11-17. In addition, Mr.
21 Shim had a copy of the redacted Infineon Settlement Agreement that was publicly available
22 through Rambus's Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") filing in 2005. Trial Tr. at
23 312:20-23 (Mr. Shim's testimony that he saw the redacted copy of the Infineon agreement filed
24 with the SEC); Trial Tr. at 957:18-958:18 (Mr. Blumberg's testimony identifying Exhibit
25 10324A as the redacted agreement in the SEC filing); Exh. 10324A. The publicly available
26 information about the Infineon settlement disclosed the term of Infineon's license, the fact that
27 neither party could terminate the license for any reason prior to its expiration, the dismissal of
28 litigation between the parties, the amount of the three payment caps, the amount of the quarterly

1 payments, the scope of the patents covered, the scope of the products licensed, and the
2 confidentiality obligations under the agreement. Exh. 10324A.

3 ee. On April 1, 2005, Mr. Blumberg wrote to Mr. Shim and withdrew Rambus's
4 February 20 Renewal Offer. Exh. 4268.

5 ff. Mr. Blumberg and Mr. Smith met with Mr. Shim on April 7, 2005 at a coffee
6 shop at the Grand Hyatt in Tokyo. The "primary focus of Mr. Shim's interest in the meeting"
7 was "discussing and getting more details about the Infineon agreement." Trial Tr. at 960:8-12.
8 During that meeting, Mr. Blumberg told Mr. Shim that "the Infineon agreement involved a lump
9 sum payment and that there was no royalty rate that would be comparable in any way or that
10 would trigger Section 3.8 of that 2000 agreement." At the April 7, 2005 meeting, Mr. Shim,
11 according to Mr. Blumberg, did not make any proposal of any kind. Trial Tr. at 961:15-16. On
12 direct examination on September 23, 2005, Mr. Shim first testified that he did not recall any
13 specific terms being discussed at the April 2005 meeting in Tokyo. Trial Tr. at 330:15-24. The
14 next day, on re-direct, he testified that at the April 2005 meeting in Tokyo, Samsung made a
15 renewal proposal with terms "consistent with what was in place for Infineon" including coverage
16 of all patents and all DRAM products, a five year capture period, and "some scale version of
17 Infineon royalty rate." *Id.* at 447:4-448:17. However, he could not recall specific terms of a
18 Samsung proposal.

19 gg. On May 11, 2005, the parties met in Tokyo at Samsung's offices. Trial
20 Tr. at 961:17-21. Mr. Blumberg and Mr. Smith attended on behalf of Rambus. *Id.* at 962:19-21.
21 At this meeting, Mr. Shim suggested some "high-level terms" that Samsung thought "would have
22 to be included in a renewal." *Id.* at 962:22-963:12. Mr. Shim did not propose any specific price
23 terms other than to say that price needed to be "in line with the Infineon deal." *Id.* at 963:13-21.
24 Mr. Shim did not "go into any details about what in line meant or in that neighborhood might
25 have been." *Id.* Mr. Shim did not mention any numbers. *Id.* at 963:22-23. In response to these
26 high level terms from Mr. Shim, Mr. Blumberg explained that a broad license such as that
27 requested by Mr. Shim would be difficult for Rambus, but that "it was a possibility if we could
28 agree on a reasonable price for such a license." *Id.* at 963:24-964:6.

hh. At the April 7, 2005 or the May 11, 2005 meeting, Mr. Blumberg told Mr.

1 Shim that Rambus would be happy to continue with the terms of the original SDR/DDR License
2 in a renewal. Trial Tr. at 1012:25-1013:11 . He does not recall whether coverage for DDR2 was
3 discussed. *Id.* at 1013:12-14.

4 ii. On May 18, 2005, Mr. Blumberg sent a further proposal to Mr. Shim. In this
5 proposal, Mr. Blumberg explained that based on recent events related to the DOJ investigation of
6 Samsung for price-fixing, the parties' discussions to date, and the "very short time available to us
7 to conclude a deal," Rambus had "determined that we cannot reach, on agreeable terms, the five
8 year patent license renewal deal you desire." Exh. 4271. Instead, Mr. Blumberg proposed that
9 "we focus on one of the options we have already discussed, namely, a one year standstill
10 agreement between the parties." *Id.* He reiterated that "[c]onclusion of such an agreement
11 before July 1 remains a top priority for Rambus." *Id.* Then, Mr. Blumberg set forth a series of
12 specific terms for a one year standstill, with price terms that would provide Samsung "the
13 prorated amount paid for such quarter by Infineon . . . multiplied by the ratio of Samsung's
14 DRAM revenue for such quarter compared to Infineon's DRAM revenue for such quarter." *Id.*
15 This amount paid under the standstill was to be a credit against royalties owed for Samsung's
16 DRAM sales during the standstill period once the parties had negotiated a new license. *Id.*
17 According to Mr. Blumberg, at the time he sent the May 18, 2005 standstill proposal, the parties
18 had been discussing the possibility of (a) doing a renewal based on the 2000 SDR/DDR License,
19 (b) doing a renewal based on the terms that Samsung had requested, provided that the price was
20 mutually agreeable, or (c) entering into a standstill. He testified that any one of those three
21 options would have been acceptable to Rambus. Trial Tr. at 1045:21-1046:5.

22 jj. In the May 18, 2005 standstill proposal, Mr. Blumberg stated that he was
23 looking forward to discussing the proposal with Mr. Shim on May 24, 2005. Exh. 4271.

24 kk. On May 24, 2005, Mr. Blumberg, Mr. Smith, and Mr. Danforth met with Mr.
25 Shim and his team at Rambus's offices in Los Altos, California. Trial Tr. at 964:19-965:3. The
26 purpose of the meeting was to get Samsung's feedback on the May 18 proposal and to "move
27 forward on renegotiating a standstill agreement." Trial Tr. at 965:6-9. Mr. Blumberg told Mr.
28 Shim why he proposed a standstill rather than a renewal. Trial Tr. at 965:10-966:17 (explaining
that because Samsung had uncertainty about the enforceability of Rambus's patents and because

1 Samsung appeared unwilling to pay a significant amount of money for a renewal, a standstill
2 made sense because it allowed the parties more time to assess the uncertainties and "more time to
3 negotiate comfortably a full renewal agreement"). In response, Mr. Shim agreed that the parties
4 "did not seem to be converging on a renewal deal" and was "open to the discussion of the
5 standstill." *Id.* at 966:18-22. However, he did not tell Rambus what price Samsung would be
6 willing to pay for a standstill or a renewal. Trial Tr. at 966:23-967:9.

7 ll. During both the May 11, 2005 and May 24, 2005 meetings, there was
8 discussion of Rambus's concern about Samsung's potential involvement in antitrust violations.
9 Trial Tr. at 967:10-13. This issue was also mentioned in Mr. Blumberg's May 18 standstill offer.
10 Exh. 4271. Mr. Blumberg explained that the antitrust issues came up because "Samsung had
11 indicated [in the renewal negotiations] that it would require a full release of all past liability,
12 including all antitrust liability in the renewal agreement." Trial Tr. at 967:16-20. Mr. Shim
13 acknowledged this. Trial Tr. at 331:19-332:6. Mr. Blumberg elaborated that "in order to
14 evaluate and properly value the antitrust release, [Rambus] needed to discuss this [antitrust]
15 evidence and those issues with Samsung." Trial Tr. at 968:4-6.

16 mm. Throughout the negotiations, Mr. Blumberg "kept telling Mr. Shim I wanted
17 to engage in negotiations to get that deal done. I thought the relationship between the companies
18 was an important one for both companies and I didn't want the lack of this agreement to be an
19 impediment to that relationship." Trial Tr. at 1044:10-22. Further, Mr. Blumberg testified that
20 "at every opportunity, I encouraged Mr. Shim to engage with me in negotiations for a renewal
21 because, among other things, that was one of the main focuses of my job." *Id.* at
22 1044:23-1045:1.

23 nn. On June 3, 2005, Mr. Shim sent Mr. Blumberg Samsung's standstill offer.
24 Exh. 4273; Trial Tr. at 968:10-13. Samsung's June 3 standstill offer proposed a \$3.5 million
25 payment for the second quarter of 2005, and \$3.5 million per quarter payments for the one-year
26 standstill. Exh. 4273, §§ 4, 7. It proposed that the parties would negotiate a five-year renewal in
27 good faith no later than the start of the fourth quarter of 2005. *Id.* at § 5. For that renewal
28 agreement to be negotiated, the term would be no less than five years with the royalty paid in
unspecified "fixed quarterly payments," the covered products would include all DRAM,

1 including DDR2+ and XDR, all Rambus patents would be covered, and there would be a \$200
2 million cap on any payments. *Id.* at §§ 8-8.4. Samsung's June 3 proposal had a most favored
3 licensee provision that provided Samsung's royalty "under the Renewal Agreement will be
4 effectively less than that of any other future Rambus licensees" and Samsung will get "the right
5 to audit future third party license agreements and replace financial terms of the Renewal
6 Agreement with those provided in any future third party license." *Id.* at § 9. The June 3
7 proposal also suggested that if any one Rambus patent was ruled unenforceable by any court,
8 regardless of whether the ruling was final or later overturned on appeal, Samsung would have the
9 option to terminate the renewal agreement and all sales of Licensed Products prior to termination
10 would be deemed licensed and paid in full. *Id.* at § 10. Mr. Blumberg testified that the proposal
11 "shocked" him and was "particularly troubling" because it seemed "incredibly one-sided." Trial
12 Tr. at 1050:15-1051:9.

13 oo. The parties met again on June 6, 2005 in Santa Clara, California. Trial
14 Tr. at 968:16-23. Mr. Blumberg, Mr. Danforth, and Mr. Smith attended on behalf of Rambus
15 and Mr. Shim and some of his associates attended on behalf of Samsung. *Id.* at 968:24-969:3.
16 At that meeting, Mr. Shim explained his June 3 proposal, but never provided calculations or
17 numbers to explain how he derived the \$3.5 million per quarter payment proposal or the \$3.5
18 million proposal for the second quarter of 2005. Trial Tr. at 969:9-971:18. Instead, Mr. Shim
19 spoke only in high level terms, stating that "due to the uncertainty of the value of Rambus's
20 patents, Samsung was not comfortable paying more than that amount." *Id.* In response, Mr.
21 Blumberg explained that Rambus was "extremely concerned and worried that this was a low ball
22 offer that Samsung was throwing on the table as if throwing down the gauntlet to say either take
23 this offer or there will be other results." *Id.* at 971:19-972:2. Specifically, Rambus's
24 representatives told Mr. Shim that "we were concerned that if we did not accept this offer, it was
25 his and Samsung's intention to file suit against Rambus." *Id.* at 972:3-6. During the June 6,
26 2005 meeting, Rambus reiterated its willingness to negotiate a deal "along the lines of" Rambus's
27 May 18 proposal. Trial Tr. at 972:7-15. Samsung did not accept Rambus's May 18 proposal.
28 *Id.* at 972:16-21. Then, Rambus offered another proposal—this time a 30-day standstill proposal
that addressed some of Rambus's concerns about Samsung initiating litigation. Trial Tr. at

1 972:22-973:8; Exh. 4275. Mr. Shim and his colleagues took a break from the negotiations to
2 privately confer for approximately an hour about the 30-day standstill proposal. Trial Tr. at
3 973:9-20. When they returned, they rejected Rambus's offer. *Id.* at 973:21-24. At no point
4 during the renewal negotiations did Samsung make an offer for renewal that included a price.
5 Trial Tr. at 974:13-16. During these renewal negotiations, no one from Samsung ever told Mr.
6 Blumberg that Section 8.5 of the SDR/DDR License required Rambus to give Samsung the
7 Infineon settlement deal. Trial Tr. at 973:25-974:6 (Mr. Blumberg's testimony that the first time
8 he had heard that theory from Samsung was during trial).

9 pp. Samsung's 30(b)(6) corporate designee on the 2005 license negotiations,
10 Seung Bum Ko, testified that "Rambus, as well as Samsung also, made its best good faith [effort]
11 to cooperate for a renewal negotiation." V109 (7/25/08 Depo. of S.B. Ko at 199:24:200:1).
12 Exhibit 9270 (30(b)(6) notice, topic 15).

13 qq. Rambus brought two pre-prepared letters to the June 6, 2005 meeting.
14 Trial Tr. at 1030:22-24. One letter contained a 30-day standstill that gave Rambus the unilateral
15 right to initiate any future litigation between the parties in the forum of its choice, and the other
16 letter terminated the 2000 SDR/DDR Agreement due to Samsung's alleged failure to comply
17 with the auditing provisions of the license. Trial Ex. 4275 (Unexecuted 30-day Standstill
18 Agreement, dated June 6, 2005); Trial Ex. 4276 (Letter from J. Danforth to J. Shim re:
19 terminating 2000 SDR/DDR Agreement, dated June 6, 2005); Trial Tr. at 304:5-14,
20 1030:25-1031:2, 1032:1-5. Any bad faith by Rambus in connection with its purported
21 termination of the 2000 SDR/DDR Agreement was not a substantial factor in the parties' failure
22 to reach an extension or renewal agreement as the parties' had irreconcilable differences on the
23 value of Rambus's technology.

24 rr. Rambus filed patent infringement lawsuits against Samsung on June
25 6, 2005 in the Northern District of California. (Complaint for Patent Infringement and Jury
26 Demand, Case No. C-05-02298, dated June 6, 2005; First Amended Complaint for Patent
27 Infringement and Jury Demand, Case No. C-05-00334, dated June 6, 2005).

28 **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

A. Rambus Breached the SDR/DDR License By Failing to Give Samsung the Benefit of the Royalty Rate Obtained By Infineon in its Settlement with Rambus

1. "Royalty Rate" Includes the Quarterly Installment Payments in the Rambus/Infineon License Agreement

The parties dispute whether the Rambus/Infineon Settlement Agreement involved a "royalty rate" as that term is used in Section 3.8 (most favored licensee provision) in the 2000 SDR/DDR License between Rambus and Samsung. Rambus was required to extend to Samsung any "royalty rate agreed to be paid . . . by a Third Party . . . for products corresponding to SDR SDRAM, DDR SDRAM, SDR SGRAM, DDR SGRAM [that] is lower than that specified in Section 3.1(b)" of the SDR/DDR License. Exh. 4226 § 3.8 (emphasis added). The issue presented is one of contract interpretation. California's rules of contract interpretation apply. *Id.* at § 9.1.

"The fundamental goal of contractual interpretation is to give effect to the mutual intention of the parties." *Powerine Oil Co. v. Superior Court*, 37 Cal. 4th 377, 390 (2005). The mutual intent of the parties is to be inferred, if possible, from the written provisions of the contract. Cal. Civ. Code § 1639. Samsung contends that the term "royalty rate" in the 2000 SDR/DDR License applies to the \$5.85 million quarterly payments under the Infineon Settlement and License Agreement. Rambus argues that "royalty rate" refers to "running royalty rates" computed as a percentage of sales and does not include the quarterly installment payments agreed to by Infineon. Rambus further argues that what the parties contemplated by Section 3.8 was the identification of a "lower royalty rate" from a third-party agreement that could be applied to Samsung in a straight forward manner and "be subject to automatic application" with no negotiation between the parties necessary to effectuate its provisions.

The plain language of Section 3.8 supports Samsung's interpretation. It reflects an intent to protect Samsung from competitive disadvantage. *See, e.g., Cardinal of Adrian, Inc. v. Amerock Corp.*, 208 U.S.P.Q. 822, 823 (E.D. Mich. 1979) ("The most favored nation clause is intended to guarantee . . . that no licensee will be given the *opportunity* to use this patent at a more favorable rate."). This intent is reinforced by the "Whereas" clauses which state that Rambus intends to charge future licensees more than that paid by Samsung.

1 The term "royalty rate" is understood to include lump sum payments for the use of
2 technology. "Technical words are to be interpreted as usually understood by persons in the
3 profession or business to which they relate, unless clearly used in a different sense." Cal. Civ.
4 Code § 1645; *see Denver D. Darling, Inc. v. Controlled Env'ts Const., Inc.*, 89 Cal. App. 4th
5 1221, 1236 (2001). Courts have noted that the term "royalty rate" or "rate of royalty" within the
6 field of patent licensing is generally understood to include lump-sum payments of various types.
7 *See, e.g., Hazeltine Co. v. Zenith Radio Co.*, 100 F.2d 10, 16 (7th Cir. 1938) (noting that the
8 court could not "escape the conclusion that a provision in a patent-license contract which
9 provides for the payment of fixed sum of money per fixed period of time for the use of a
10 patented invention states a rate of royalty within the generally understood and recognized
11 meaning of that phrase"); *Cardinal of Adrian, Inc.*, 208 U.S.P.Q. at 823. Samsung's economic
12 expert, Dr. Keith Ugone, gave essentially unrebutted expert testimony that the term "royalty
13 rate" in licensing agreements can refer to a number of different royalty structures, including the
14 variable royalty rate found in the Infineon Settlement and License Agreement.

15 Rambus itself used "royalty rate" to refer to the installment payments by Infineon under
16 its settlement agreement with Rambus. In its SEC filings, Rambus used the terms "royalty,"
17 "rate" and "royalty rate" to describe the payment terms in the Infineon Settlement and License
18 Agreement, including specifically the \$5.85 million quarterly rate.

19 Interpretation of the term "royalty rate" to not include quarterly lump sum payments
20 would fly in the face of what the parties intended to accomplish by Section 3.8. Although the
21 mutual intent of the parties is to be determined, if possible, from the written provisions of the
22 contract, the court must consider extrinsic evidence that is "relevant to prove a meaning to which
23 the language of the instrument is reasonably susceptible." *Pac. Gas & Elec. v. Thomas Drayage*
24 *& Rigging Co.*, 69 Cal. 2d 33, 37 (1968). The negotiations leading up to the execution of the
25 2000 SDR/DDR License clearly show that the intent of the parties was to ensure that Samsung
26 would not be at a competitive disadvantage with third parties specifically including Infineon.
27 Geoff Tate, Rambus's Chief Executive Officer, assured Samsung that Rambus would charge
28 Infineon, Hynix, and Micron "substantially higher license fees and royalty rates." Exh. 4218.

Neil Steinberg reassured Samsung during negotiation of the 2000 SDR/DDR Agreement that he

1 had modified the language in a related section of the agreement to "provide language expressing
2 the fundamental intent of Section 3.9 that Samsung not be put at a competitive disadvantage as a
3 result of entering into the Agreement." Exh. 4216. Rambus at the time the SDR/DDR License
4 was signed desperately needed an alliance with Samsung and, therefore, was willing to assure
5 Samsung of favored treatment.

6 The mutual intent of Rambus and Samsung as determined by the words used in the
7 SDR/DDR License and the extrinsic evidence detailing the surrounding circumstances in which
8 they negotiated the contract supports Samsung's interpretation of "royalty." A review of the
9 parol evidence shows that Section 3.8 is reasonably susceptible, in fact only susceptible, to the
10 interpretation urged by Samsung.

11 **2. The Rambus/Infineon Settlement Triggered Rambus's Obligation to**
12 **Samsung Under Section 3.8 of the 2000 SDR/DDR License**

13 The Infineon Settlement and License Agreement (i.e., the variable royalty rate as set forth
14 in Article 6) contains a "royalty rate" agreed to be paid by Infineon for, among other things, the
15 products that were specified in Section 3.8 of the 2000 SDR/DDR Agreement. Specifically, the
16 royalty rate agreed of \$5.85 million per quarter that Infineon agreed to pay for, among other
17 things, the relevant products subject to Samsung's most favored licensee rights was clearly
18 "lower than [Samsung's royalty rate as] specified in Section 3.1(b)" for the second quarter of
19 2005. Pursuant to Section 3.8 of the 2000 SDR/DDR Agreement, Rambus was obligated to
20 make that rate effective for Samsung as of April 1, 2005, "the first day of the royalty reporting
21 period in which written notice" was required by the reinstatement of Section 3.8 following
22 Rambus's termination of the 2001 Amendment. "It is likely to be generally true that a licensor's
23 grant of more favorable terms is supported by a sound business reason, but the benefit of more
24 favorable terms is exactly what the person whose license includes an MFL clause has bargained
25 for and to which he is entitled." *Studiengesellschaft Kohle m.b.H. v. Novamont Corp.*, 704 F.2d
26 48, 53 (2d Cir. 1983); *see Cardinal of Adrian*, 208 U.S.P.Q. at 823 ("[W]here a patent licensor
27 has later granted a paid up license for a sum certain, a licensee who has a most favored nation
28 clause is entitled to a paid-up license for the same sum.").

3. Rambus Breached Section 3.8 of the 2000 SDR/DDR License Agreement

The elements of a claim for breach of contract are: "(1) the contract; (2) plaintiff's performance or excuse for nonperformance; (3) defendant's breach; and (4) the resulting damages to plaintiff." *See, e.g., Reichert v. Gen. Ins. Co. of Am.*, 68 Cal. 2d 822, 830 (1968). There is no dispute that the parties entered into a contract (2000 SDR/DDR License). Samsung performed. (Rambus's claim that Samsung failed to comply under the audit provision was not proved). Samsung was damaged when Rambus refused to make the \$5.85 million per quarter royalty rate paid by Infineon effective for Samsung on April 1, 2005.² Samsung has established by a preponderance of evidence that Rambus breached the 2000 SDR/DDR License by such refusal.

4. Rambus Failed to Prove that Samsung Breached the Audit Provision of the SDR/DDR Agreement

Rambus claims it properly terminated the 2000 SDR/DDR Agreement on the basis that Samsung breached its audit obligations under Section 4.1 of that agreement. However, Rambus did not establish such a breach by a preponderance of the evidence. Rambus did not offer any exhibits that were delivered to Samsung that revealed the alleged underpayment and Rambus accepted Samsung's royalty payment for the first quarter of 2005 without objection. In addition, the timing and circumstances existing at the time Rambus purportedly terminated the 2000 SDR/DDR Agreement suggest that Rambus's purported termination for the alleged audit breach

² Rambus has not sought to recover royalties that otherwise would be due under the license for the second quarter of 2005. Rambus purportedly terminated the license based on the alleged audit breach on June 6, 2005, which was before both the end of the license term (June 30, 2005) and the date when Samsung's payment obligation for the second quarter of 2005 otherwise would have come due. (Exh. 4226 at § 4.2). Rambus did not have a right to terminate the license based on the audit breach. As a result, Rambus's decision to terminate the license in favor of suing Samsung before the end of the license term constituted a repudiation of the license and hence a material breach of it. *See, e.g., Sackett v. Spindler*, 248 Cal. App. 2d 220, 229 (Cal. App. 1st Dist. 1967) (noting that a party that terminates a contract based on anything less than a material breach by its counterparty unlawfully repudiates the agreement and places it "in total breach" of the contract); 13-68 Corbin on Contracts § 68.3 ("If under the circumstances, however, a party's breach is a total breach, the injured party's duty of performance is discharged, including the obligation to compensate, on the contract, for any part performance."). As a result, Rambus cannot enforce the license to recover royalties that otherwise would have been due for the second quarter of 2005. *See Cox v. Ocean View Hotel Corp.*, 533 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2008); *De Burgh v. De Burgh*, 39 Cal. 2d 858, 863 (Cal. 1952); *Kaiser Trading Co. v. Associated Metals & Minerals*, 321 F. Supp. 923, 929 (N.D. Cal 1970)

1 was pretextual and the real reason was the advantage it sought it could achieve by instituting a
2 lawsuit for patent infringement.

3 **B. Rambus Did Not Breach the SDR/DDR License By Failing to Negotiate in Good**
4 **Faith An Extension or Renewal**

5 **1. Section 8.5 Did Not Require Rambus to Offer an Extension or Renewal that**
6 **Covered DDR2 SDRAM and Subsequent Product Generations**

7 Under Section 8.5 of the 2000 SDR/DDR License the parties agreed "to negotiate in good
8 faith with a view to achieving a mutually satisfactory patent license agreement under the Rambus
9 Patents *with respect to Licensed Products*, including, without limitation, an extension hereof or a
10 new agreement." (Emphasis added). Samsung contends that Section 1.7's definition of
11 "DDR/SDRAM(s)" includes DDR2 SDRAM and subsequent product generations and, therefore
12 as "Licensed Products" were required to be included in the parties' attempt to achieve a
13 "mutually satisfactory patent license agreement." Rambus maintains that Samsung's DDR2 and
14 subsequent product generations are beyond the scope of DDR SDRAM as defined in Section 1.7.

15 As previously discussed, under California law "[t]he fundamental goal of contractual
16 interpretation is to give effect to the mutual intention of the parties" (*Powerine Oil Co.*, 37 Cal.
17 4th at 390) and the mutual intent of the parties is to be inferred, if possible, from the written
18 provisions of the contract. Cal. Civ. Code § 1639. Nevertheless, the court must consider
19 extrinsic evidence that is "relevant to prove a meaning to which the language of the instrument is
20 reasonably susceptible." *Pac. Gas & Elec.*, 69 Cal. 2d at 37. The plain language of Section 1.7
21 supports Rambus's position that Samsung's DDR2 products are not covered because they are not
22 identical to the eight specific Samsung products identified in Section 1.7, nor do they merely add
23 one of the approved differences set forth in Section 1.7. Further, during negotiation of the 2000
24 SDR/DDR License Rambus, as acknowledged by Samsung, did not want the Agreement to cover
25 future DRAM generations and did not budge from its originally proposed definition of "Licensed
26 Products."

27 Samsung argues that Mr. Steinberg represented to Mr. Shim during the negotiations that
28 the Agreement as proposed covered evolutionary changes and that all of the differences between
Samsung's DDR and DDR2 products are evolutionary changes. What Mr. Steinberg did say in
an email was that he felt that Section 1.7 "adequately covers devices which may have

1 evolutionary (as opposed to revolutionary) differences from the devices specified by part
2 number." Exh. 4216 at 1. Mr. Steinberg did not represent that all evolutionary changes would
3 be covered, nor did the parties ever discuss what each understood "evolutionary" to mean. Most
4 importantly, the Agreement did not use the term "evolutionary" or "revolutionary." The
5 language of the SDR/DDR License is not reasonably susceptible to an interpretation that any
6 change that is "evolutionary" is covered by the approved listed differences in Section 1.7.
7 Therefore, Rambus had no good faith obligation under Section 8.5 to include Samsung's DDR2
8 and subsequent product generations in the parties' attempt to achieve a "mutually satisfactory
9 patent license agreement."

10 **2. The Parties Never Agreed Expressly or Impliedly that Samsung Would**
11 **Receive Most Favored Licensee Protection in a Renewal of the SDR/DDR**
License or in a New Patent License Agreement

12 Samsung sought during negotiation of the SDR/DDR Agreement assurance that it would
13 continue to have most favored licensee status following the expiration of the Agreement. When
14 Samsung signed the SDR/DDR Agreement, there was no provision promising a most favored
15 royalty condition in any extension or new patent license. However, Mr. Shim and Mr. Steinberg
16 had agreed to negotiate an amendment to the SDR/DDR Agreement to address this concern. Mr.
17 Shim sent Mr. Steinberg a proposal shortly after the SDR/DDR Agreement was executed and
18 Mr. Steinberg shortly thereafter sent a proposed revised amendment. Mr. Shim did not respond
19 and neither proposed amendment was ever signed. Samsung did not respond to Mr. Steinberg's
20 proposal because Samsung believed "about this time, and for the period of many months that
21 followed, there were some serious concerns as to Rambus's I.P., and we were reviewing many
22 different aspects of lawsuits that were going on." Trial Tr. at 248:19-22. Therefore, no most
23 favored royalty or licensee provision can be incorporated into the SDR/DDR License either
24 expressly or impliedly because (1) one was never agreed to and (2) Section 10.9 of the
25 SDR/DDR Agreement required any "alteration, amendment, waiver, cancellation or any other
26 change in any term or condition of [the] Agreement . . . [to] have been mutually assented to in
27 writing by both parties." Exh. 4226, § 10.9.

28 Samsung's contends that the covenant of good faith and fair dealing implied in the 2000
SDR/DDR Agreement required Rambus to offer an extension or a new patent license agreement

1 that recognized most favored licensee status for Samsung. The implied covenant of good faith
2 and fair dealing that exists in all contracts is limited to assuring compliance with the express
3 terms of the contract, and cannot be extended to create obligations not contemplated in the
4 contract. *Racine & Laramie, Ltd. v. Department of Parks & Recreation*, 11 Cal. App. 4th 1026,
5 1032 (1993). No express term of the 2000 SDR/DDR License required Samsung to be given
6 most favored licensee status on renewal of the License or in a new patent license agreement. The
7 parties had an obligation to negotiate in good faith, but despite discussing the inclusion of a most
8 favored licensee provision in Section 8.5 of the 2000 SDR/DDR Agreement, the parties for
9 whatever reason, knowingly did not do so and thus their good faith obligation did not include
10 negotiation of most favored licensee protection.

11 **3. The Failure of the Parties to Negotiate an Extension to the SDR/DDR**
12 **Agreement or a Mutually Satisfactory New License Agreement Was Not**
Caused by Any Lack of Good Faith

13 Rambus initiated renewal negotiations in July 2004, which was well before the six
14 month deadline required by Section 8.5 of the 2000 SDR/DDR License for the commencement
15 of negotiations. Rambus made an offer for renewal on February 20, 2005. Samsung never
16 accepted Rambus's February 20, 2005 Renewal Offer. Samsung's assertion that this offer was
17 withdrawn in bad faith before Samsung had a chance to respond to it is not supported by the
18 evidence. To the contrary, the evidence demonstrates that Samsung had nearly six weeks to
19 consider that renewal offer, was informed that the offer was time sensitive and was warned that it
20 would be withdrawn in the event that Rambus settled with Infineon. Rambus met with Samsung
21 representatives on March 8 to discuss the renewal offer nearly a month before it was ultimately
22 withdrawn.

23 After Rambus settled with Infineon and withdrew its February 20 Renewal Offer,
24 Rambus continued to make efforts to negotiate with Samsung. Rambus presented several
25 options for renewal and for a standstill agreement between April 1, 2005 and June 6, 2005. The
26 May 18 standstill offer from Rambus was not in bad faith even though it did not offer a full
27 renewal or extension. The evidence demonstrated that both parties thought it made sense to
28 switch to a standstill given the uncertainties about a renewal expressed by both sides. Moreover,
Mr. Blumberg testified that the goal of a standstill agreement was to reach resolution of the

dispute before the expiration of the SDR/DDR License in such a way that it allowed more time for the parties to negotiate and come to agreement on a renewal or extension.

Rambus considered Samsung's June 3 offer to be a low-ball offer with one-sided terms, and as a result, was worried Samsung was not taking the negotiation seriously. However, the pretextual termination of the SDR/DDR License and filing suit against Samsung at the end of their negotiation session on June 6, 2005, the date that turned out to be their last day of negotiation, was not part of a good faith negotiation but rather a tactic designed to gain a litigation advantage if Rambus decided that the parties were not going to reach agreement. However, that tactic did not cause the parties' failure to reach agreement. As of June 6, 2005 the parties clearly had irreconcilable differences about the value of a license of Rambus's patents.

"Good faith [does] not require [a party] to accede to . . . one-sided modifications." *Auerbach v. Great Western Bank*, 74 Cal. App. 4th 1172, 1191-92 (1999). *See also Phoenix Mut. Life Ins. Co. v. Shady Grove Plaza Ltd. Partnership*, 734 F. Supp. 1181, 1190 (D. Md. 1990) ("The duty [to bargain in] good faith . . . does not prohibit a party from bargaining to its own economic advantage . . ."). As stated by the Seventh Circuit in *A/S Apotekernes Laboratorium for Specialpraeparater v. I.M.C. Chem. Group*, 873 F.2d 155, 159 (7th Cir. 1989):

In a business transaction both sides presumably try to get the best of the deal. That is the essence of bargaining and the free market. And in the context of this case, no legal rule bounds the run of business interest. So one cannot characterize self-interest as bad faith. No particular demand in negotiations could be termed dishonest, even if it seemed outrageous to the other party. The proper recourse is to walk away from the bargaining table, not to sue for "bad faith" in negotiations.

The failure of the parties to agree did not result from the breach of the duty to negotiate in good faith.

4. Even If Rambus Breached an Obligation to Negotiate in Good Faith, Samsung Has Not Proved an Entitlement to Damages

In *Copeland v. Baskin Robbins U.S.A.* the California court of appeals recognized that a cause of action exists under California law for breach of a contract to negotiate. 96 Cal. App. 4th 1255-60 (2002). The court, however, cautioned that the "uncertain concept" of "bad faith" should not permit an aggrieved party to claim the benefit of a contract that was never consummated and restricted the damages available to a plaintiff in duty-to-negotiate cases: "the

1 appropriate remedy for breach of a contract to negotiate is not damages for the injured party's
2 lost expectations under the prospective contract but damages caused by the injured party's
3 reliance on the agreement to negotiate." *Id.* at 1260-61. The court further explained:

4 For obvious reasons, damages for breach of a contract to negotiate an agreement
5 are measured by the injury the plaintiff suffered in relying on the defendant to
6 negotiate in good faith. This measure encompasses the plaintiff's out-of-pocket
7 costs in conducting the negotiations and may or may not include lost opportunity
8 costs. The plaintiff cannot recover for lost expectations (profits) because there is
9 no way of knowing what the ultimate terms of the agreement would have been or
10 even if there would have been an ultimate agreement.

11 *Id.* at 1262-63.

12 Here, Samsung did not seek nor offer evidence of any damages sustained in reliance upon
13 Rambus's commitment to negotiate a renewal agreement in good faith. Samsung seeks only
14 expectation damages—that is, the value of a renewal or new agreement that the parties never
15 made. For this reason, even if it had been able to prove that Rambus breached its duty to
16 negotiate in good faith for a renewal agreement, Samsung would not be entitled to expectation
17 damages.

18 **C. Samsung's Affirmative Defense of Equitable Estoppel**

19 Samsung argues that Rambus should be equitably estopped from seeking patent
20 infringement damages beyond the royalties paid by Infineon for the products that would have
21 been covered by the renewal license Samsung contends that Rambus was obligated to enter.
22 Samsung bases its argument on the assurances Rambus made to Samsung during the negotiation
23 of the 2000 SDR/DDR License that Samsung would have a competitive advantage over those
24 who chose to litigate with Rambus, by fulfilling its obligations under the 2000 SDR/DDR
25 Agreement and by its willingness to negotiate in good faith under Section 8.5 of the 2000
26 SDR/DDR License.

27 To establish an estoppel defense, Samsung had the burden to prove: "(a) a representation
28 or concealment of material facts (b) made with knowledge, actual or virtual, of the facts (c) to a
party ignorant, actually and permissibly, of the truth (d) with the intention, actual or virtual, that
the ignorant party act on it, and (e) that party [relied] on it [to his injury]." 13 Witkin, Summary
10th (2005) Equity, § 191 at 527-28; *Wood v. Blaney*, 107 Cal. 291, 295 (1895); *Wells Fargo*


1 *Bank v. Bank of America*, 32 Cal. App. 4th 424, 438 (1995). Moreover, in order to meet the
2 reliance requirement, the party seeking an estoppel must demonstrate that the reliance was
3 reasonable. *Martinez v. Scott Specialty Gases, Inc.*, 83 Cal. App. 4th 1236, 1248 (2000) (holding
4 that "[e]stoppel requires, among other things, reasonable reliance on the other party's actions"
5 and rejecting estoppel where "plaintiffs could not reasonably have been misled") (emphasis in
6 original). Samsung did not establish that it could reasonably have relied on Rambus's alleged
7 promises that Samsung would be granted protections vis-à-vis its competitors in litigation with
8 Rambus beyond those set forth in the language of the 2000 SDR/DDR License itself. Samsung
9 is a sophisticated company that was represented by experienced lawyers in the 2000 licensing
10 negotiations with Rambus. The parties, through their lawyers, established a fully-integrated
11 written agreement that expressly established California law as the applicable state law. In
12 California, the Supreme Court had long held that, under the parol evidence rule, evidence of
13 prior or contemporaneous agreements or understandings between the contract negotiators cannot
14 be used to "add to, detract from, or vary the terms" of the parties' written agreement. *Pacific Gas*
15 *& Elec. Co.*, 69 Cal. 2d at 37. To the extent Samsung purports to have relied upon its own
16 interpretation of Section 3.8 based on extra-contractual statements made by Rambus's negotiators
17 that were not incorporated into the terms of the 2000 SDR/DDR License, such reliance was
18 inherently unreasonable. Samsung also could not reasonably have relied on the alleged promise
19 that Rambus would offer the "Infineon deal" in any renewal or extension of the SDR/DDR
20 License because such reliance would have added a promise to Section 8.5 which is not an
21 automatic renewal provision and expressly states that the parties agree only to negotiate in good
22 faith "with a view to achieving a mutually satisfactory" agreement Exh. 4226 at § 8.5. Section
23 8.5 identifies no terms that were to be carried over into any new licensing agreement.

24 **D. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

25 The disposition of Counts I-III and the affirmative defense of equitable estoppel required
26 by these Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law will be incorporated into any judgment that is
27 later entered in either of the captioned cases. An unredacted copy of this order will be
28

1 publicly filed within seven (7) days of the date of this order, absent a meritorious request by a
2 party that certain portions of the order be redacted from the publicly filed copy.

3
4 DATED: 04/27/09



RONALD M. WHYTE
United States District Judge

1 Notice of this document has been electronically sent to counsel in: all cases.

		Appearances:				
	Counsel	Email	05-00334	05-02298	06-00244	00-20905
3	Rambus:					
4	Kathryn Kalb Anderson	Kate.Anderson@mto.com	x		x	
	Peter A. Detre	detrepa@mto.com	x	x	x	x
5	Erin C. Dougherty	erin.dougherty@mto.com	x	x	x	x
	Sean Eskovitz	sean.eskovitz@mto.com	x	x	x	x
6	Burton Alexander Gross	Burton.Gross@mto.com	x	x	x	x
	Keith Rhoderic Dhu Hamilton, II	keith.hamilton@mto.com	x	x	x	x
7	Pierre J. Hubert	phubert@mckoolsmith.com	x	x	x	x
	Andrea Jill Weiss Jeffries	Andrea.Jeffries@mto.com	x	x	x	
8	Miriam Kim	Miriam.Kim@mto.com	x	x	x	x
	Carolyn Hoecker Luedtke	carolyn.luedtke@mto.com	x	x	x	x
9	Steven McCall Perry	steven.perry@mto.com	x	x	x	x
	Jennifer Lynn Polse	jen.polse@mto.com	x	x	x	x
10	Matthew Thomas Powers	mpowers@sidley.com	x			
	Rollin Andrew Ransom	rransom@sidley.com	x	x	x	x
11	Rosemarie Theresa Ring	rose.ring@mto.com	x	x	x	x
	Gregory P. Stone	gregory.stone@mto.com	x	x	x	x
12	Craig N. Tolliver	ctolliver@mckoolsmith.com	x	x	x	x
	Donald Ward	Bill.Ward@mto.com	x	x	x	
13	David C. Yang	david.yang@mto.com	x	x	x	x
	Douglas A. Cawley	dcawley@mckoolsmith.com			x	
14	Scott L Cole	scole@mckoolsmith.com			x	
	William Hans Baumgartner, Jr	wbaumgartner@sidley.com				x
15	Scott W. Hejny	shejny@sidley.com				x
	Kelly Max Klaus	kelly.klaus@mto.com				x
16	Catherine Rajwani	crajwani@sidley.com				x
	Thomas N Tarnay	ttarnay@sidley.com				x
17	Hynix:					
18	Theodore G. Brown , III	tgbrown@townsend.com	x	x	x	x
	Daniel J. Furniss	djfurniss@townsend.com	x			x
19	Joseph A. Greco	jagreco@townsend.com	x			x
	Julie Jinsook Han	JJHan@townsend.com	x	x	x	
20	Tomomi Katherine Harkey	tharkey@omm.com	x			x
	Jordan Trent Jones	jtjones@townsend.com	x			x
21	Patrick Lynch	plynch@omm.com	x			x
	Kenneth Lee Nissly	kennissly@omm.com	x		x	x
22	Kenneth Ryan O'Rourke	korourke@omm.com	x			x
	Belinda Martinez Vega	bvega@omm.com	x	x	x	x
23	Geoffrey Hurndall Yost	gyost@thelenreid.com	x	x	x	x
	Susan Gregory van Keulen	svankeulen@omm.com	x		x	x
24	Allen Ruby	ruby@allenrubylaw.com				x
25	Micron:					
26	Robert Jason Becher	robertbecher@quinnemanuel.com	x		x	x
	John D Beynon	john.beynon@weil.com	x	x	x	x
27	Jared Bobrow	jared.bobrow@weil.com	x	x	x	x
	Yonaton M Rosenzweig	yonirosenzweig@quinnemanuel.com	x		x	x
28	Harold Avrum Barza	halbarza@quinnemanuel.com			x	
	Linda Jane Brewer	lindabrewer@quinnemanuel.com			x	
	Aaron Bennett Craig	aaroncraig@quinnemanuel.com			x	x

1	Leeron Kalay	kalay@fr.com					X
	David J. Lender	david.lender@weil.com					X
2	Rachael Lynn Ballard McCracken	rachaelmccracken@quinnemanuel.com					X
	Sven Raz	sven.raz@weil.com					X
3	David J. Ruderman	davidruderman@quinnemanuel.com					X
	Elizabeth Stotland Weiswasser	elizabeth.weiswasser@weil.com					X
4	Nanya:						
5	Jason Sheffield Angell	jangell@orrick.com	X	X		X	X
	Kristin Sarah Cornuelle	kcornuelle@orrick.com	X	X		X	
6	Chester Wren-Ming Day	cday@orrick.com	X				
	Jan Ellen Ellard	jellard@orrick.com	X			X	
7	Vickie L. Feeman	vfeeman@orrick.com	X	X		X	
	Robert E. Freitas	rfreitas@orrick.com	X				
8	Craig R. Kaufman	hlee@orrick.com	X				
	Hao Li	hli@orrick.com	X				
9	Cathy Yunshan Lui	clui@orrick.com	X				
	Theresa E. Norton	tnorton@orrick.com	X				
10	Mark Shean	mshean@orrick.com	X				
11	Kaiwen Tseng	ktseng@orrick.com	X				
12	Samsung:						
	Steven S. Cherensky	steven.cherensky@weil.com	X	X			
13	Dana Prescott Kenned Powers	dana.powers@weil.com	X	X		X	
	Matthew Douglas Powers	matthew.powers@weil.com , matthew.antonelli@weil.com	X	X			
14	Edward Robert Reines	Edward.Reines@weil.com	X	X			X
15	United States Dept. of Justice						
16	May Lee Heye	may.hey@usdoj.gov					X
	Eugene S. Litvinoff	eugene.litvinoff@usdoj.gov					X
17	Niall Edmund Lynch	Niall.Lynch@USDOJ.GOV					X

18 Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel that have not
 19 registered for e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program in each action.

20 **Dated:** 04/27/09 TER
 21 **Chambers of Judge Whyte**